Class 252P Book M133
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York
Beside the main topic, this book also treats of

Subject No.	*On page*	*Subject No.*	*On page*

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo, 6s.

CHRISTIANITY

IN RELATION TO

SCIENCE AND MORALS.

A COURSE OF LECTURES DELIVERED IN RIPON CATHEDRAL ON THE NICENE CREED.

By MALCOLM MacCOLL, M.A.,

CANON RESIDENTIARY OF RIPON
AND RECTOR OF ST. GEORGE'S, CITY OF LONDON

LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY
LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"The publication of this book illustrates remarkably and hopefully the amount of interest which can still be excited by a judicious and sympathetic presentation of theological teaching. . . . It will, we are persuaded, be profitable for confirmation in belief and for the abatement of popular anti-dogmatic prejudices. . . . It is long since we have noticed a work from which we should so gladly have quoted more."—*Church Quarterly Review.*

"This is a very delightful book, and very far indeed from one the interest of which will be confined chiefly to professional theologians. Canon MacColl is master of a very winning and easy style, has studied theology earnestly, read largely in general literature, conversed with the most thoughtful men of his own generation, and gathered up the results of all this reading and conversation in a mind that has no feeble grasp of its own."—*Spectator.*

"Viewed as a whole, these lectures form an excellent course of instruction upon the truths with which they deal. . . . Altogether the

volume may be said to provide what may be called a nineteenth-century vindication of the Nicene Creed."—*Guardian.*

"The twelve lectures of which this volume consists are a timely and weighty addition to our apologetic literature: timely, because they deal with the latest forms of sceptical objections to Christianity; weighty, because they are solid and logical in thought and form, and not mere outbursts of emotional rhetoric on the wickedness of unbelief."—*Church Times.*

"An admirable book, full of good thought, set out in a pleasantly rhetorical style."—*Saturday Review.*

"The success of these lectures is very remarkable; but it is fully deserved. The vigour of the style, the clear and striking arguments, and the power of the intellectual grasp in which the writer holds his subject, amply justify the large circulation which the book has attained. We should not be far wrong in styling it the ablest apologetic work upon the Creed which has appeared for the last twenty years."—*Literary Churchman.*

"The practical teaching which the author conveys, and the ability with which he has analysed the various points in the Church's ancient symbol of faith, have met with due recognition, and there is every prospect of a widening sphere of usefulness in which the book may be the means of bringing home to inquiring minds the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion. A special interest, however, attaches to the preface to the present edition, inasmuch as it contains copious extracts from a letter written by the late Bishop of Durham to the author in relation to some issues raised by him in certain portions of the volume."—*Morning Post.*

"This is an extremely clever and ingenious exposition of the Nicene Creed, and naturally deals with questions outside the province of a literary journal. The main object of the author is to meet the objections to the supernatural which the diffusion of scientific knowledge has undoubtedly called forth, and Canon MacColl shows much dialectic skill in expounding his own view of miracles and showing its compatibility with modern scientific theories."—*Athenæum.*

LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY: LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

LIFE HERE AND HEREAFTER

LIFE
HERE AND HEREAFTER

SERMONS PREACHED IN RIPON CATHEDRAL AND ELSEWHERE

BY

MALCOLM MacCOLL, M.A.

CANON RESIDENTIARY OF RIPON

SECOND EDITION

REVISED, WITH NEW PREFACE

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

1896

All rights reserved

29598

252 P
M133

Dedication.

IN MEMORY OF MANY HAPPY DAYS

SPENT TOGETHER ON THE NILE, IN PALESTINE,

AND IN

CRUISING OVER GREEK AND TURKISH SEAS;

IN MEMORY, ABOVE ALL,

OF MOST TENDER AND SELF-SACRIFICING MINISTRATIONS

DURING AN ALMOST FATAL ILLNESS;

I INSCRIBE THIS VOLUME,

MOST GRATEFULLY AND AFFECTIONATELY,

TO THE MOST ATTRACTIVELY UNSELFISH HUMAN BEING

WHOM I HAVE EVER KNOWN,

THE MARCHIONESS OF WATERFORD.

9 My 1900
$1.50

PREFACE

The sermons in this volume are republished from reports of them which appeared at the time in various newspapers, most of them in the *Ripon Gazette* and in the *Harrogate Advertiser*, and a few in the *Standard*, *Morning Post*, *Church Times*, and *Contemporary Pulpit*. In revising these reports, I have confined myself chiefly to verbal corrections, partly because the pressure of other occupations has left me no time for a more thorough revision, and partly because I have been urged by many (most of them strangers), who read the reports of the sermons on Immortality and the Spiritual Life, to publish them with as little delay as possible. All the sermons were preached from brief notes, and I have no doubt

that I owe many thoughts to sources which I cannot now remember and acknowledge. I have been touched by some of the letters—several of them anonymous—which I have received from persons who declare that they have been encouraged to renew the struggle against temptation, after they had resigned themselves to despair, by the hope inspired by some of the sermons. I suppose that the close of an era naturally tends to engender despondency and pessimism. Certainly that is a characteristic of the period in which we are living, and I feel that there is great need of the consolations and hopes which Christianity, rightly understood, is so well calculated to inspire.

MALCOLM MACCOLL.

RIPON,
November, 1894.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

It was my intention to avail myself in this edition of some thoughtful suggestions made by an able and acute friend, and by a friendly reviewer in the *Spectator*. But the call for a second edition has reached me on the Continent, and the *Spectator* review and my friend's criticism are in London. The new edition, therefore, appears without any alteration beyond verbal corrections and a few emendations in grammar and style.

Out of a large number of reviews of the volume which have appeared in America and the Colonies, as well as in this country, a very few have deprecated the too hopeful view, as they think, which I have taken of the future condition of sinners. My own belief, however, founded on a somewhat wide and varied experience, is that hope is a better deterrent against sin than despondency. I am far from suggesting that there is no danger from delusive hope;

from the fallacy that, because God is love, therefore the sinner may presume on His mercy, without much striving, "to enter in at the strait and narrow gate that leadeth unto life"—a fallacy which ignores the all-important truth, that eternal happiness depends on character quite as much as on external surroundings; on a heavenly temper quite as much as on entrance into heaven. So far from overlooking this truth, I have insisted on it repeatedly in the following sermons. But experience has forced upon me at the same time the conviction that many give up the struggle against sin from discouragement at repeated failures. Many letters to that effect, mostly anonymous, have reached me, both since the publication of this volume, and also from readers of the reports of them which appeared in some newspapers as they were preached. The following anonymous postcard, which I reproduce *verbatim et literatim*, is a sample of many similar communications:—

"Thank God for the new energy to persevere your sermon on 'The Many Mansions' has put into a person 'of weak and wavering will.' To such natures—and their name is legion—sermons are too often simply 'dampers.' They don't give us hope, and it is *hopelessness*, more than anything else, that drives us to despair, and to give up persevering. We hard-working people have little time or inclination to read religious books, and such of us as care for religion

look to sermons for instruction by the way. Too often we get on the one side, 'The Church, the Church,' and, on the other, 'Conversion' and '*Only believe.*' If only we could get such a Christ-like, hopeful Gospel as *you* preach, there would not be so many unbelievers and ones quite indifferent to religion amongst us. I know several who say, 'What's the good of trying? I always break down. I'm sick and weary of it all.' I've felt so myself, but never will again after that sermon. Hope will make me persevere."

In a volume entitled, "The Faithful Departed: Shall we Pray for Them? By a Lay Churchman," the author, in a courteous criticism of my sermons on the future life, condemns, as contrary to Holy Scripture and the Book of Common Prayer, the doctrine of an intermediate state of purification and its corollary, the practice of praying for the dead. I venture to think that the chapter on that subject in the Appendix to this volume is a sufficient answer to my critic, and therefore I will only add here a remark made to me by a distinguished statesman, which goes to the root of the matter: "I do not see how prayers for the dead can be condemned without undermining the doctrine of prayers for the living." Both rest on the same principle, namely, that God needs neither, but deigns to use both as means of attracting His blessing. The only

rational ground for condemning prayers for the faithful departed is the belief that they all pass out of this world in a fit state for the instantaneous enjoyment of the Beatific Vision; surely a belief hardly reconcilable with reason, to say nothing of Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Church always and everywhere. The belief which we find prevalent in the early ages of the Church is that, with the exception of Enoch and Elias, and those who were privileged to anticipate, with Christ, the general resurrection, the faithful departed await the general resurrection in what our Lord calls "Paradise" and "Abraham's bosom": a place of rest, of purification, of peace, light, joy and refreshment, in proportion to the spiritual condition of each. This intermediate state is therefore an abode of "many mansions," as even heaven itself must be through the ages of eternity, since its inhabitants, both angelic and human, enjoy its manifold bliss in exact proportion to their varied capacities; some more, some less, but all to the full extent of their powers, which, however, will expand indefinitely by exercise, always approaching, but never reaching, the Uncreated Source of all beauty.

Bingham gives an accurate statement of the doctrine of undivided Christendom on this subject, of which the following is a brief summary. He gives six reasons why the early Church prayed for the dead.

(1) Prayer was offered in all the early liturgies "for all the saints, martyrs, confessors, patriarchs, prophets, and even the Virgin Mary herself, and all other holy men and women from the foundation of the world, who were supposed to be in a place of rest and happiness, not in any place of purgation or torment." He instances the prayers of St. Ambrose for persons "of whom he had not the least doubt but that their souls were in rest and happiness;" and St. Austin, who prayed for his mother that she might be cleansed from any remaining stains of sin—clearly implying a state, though of felicity, still short of heaven. (2) "Upon the same presumption some of those prayers for the dead were always eucharistical." (3) "Because they justly conceived all men to die with some remainders of frailty and corruption, and therefore desired that God would deal with them according to His mercy, and not in strict justice according to their deserts; for no one was then thought to have any real merit or title to eternal happiness, but only upon God's promises and mercy. St. Austin discourses excellently upon this point in the case of his mother Monica." And Bingham quotes a long passage from the Confessions to prove his point. St. Austin evidently believed that his mother was in a state of happiness, yet of happiness short of heaven. (4) The reason given by Epiphanius, namely, "that it was to put a distinction between the perfection of

Christ and the imperfection of all other men, saints, martyrs, apostles, prophets, confessors, etc., He being the only Person for whom prayer was not then made in the Church." (5) To show their belief in the continued existence of the departed. (6) "Whereas the soul is but in an imperfect state of happiness till the resurrection, when the whole man shall obtain a complete victory over death, and by the last judgment be established in an endless state of consummate happiness."

In addition to these "general reasons," Bingham enumerates some particular reasons. (1) "A great many of the ancients believed that the souls of all the righteous, except martyrs, were sequestered out of heaven, in some place which they called Hades, or Paradise, or Abraham's bosom; a place of refreshment and joy, where they expected a completer happiness at the end of all things. This is the known opinion of Hermas Pastor, Justin Martyr, Pope Pius, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Caius, Romanus, Victorinus Martyr, Novatian, Lactantius, Hilary, Ambrose, Gregory Nyssen, Prudentius, Austin, and Chrysostom. Therefore, in praying for the dead, they may be supposed to have some reference to this, and to desire that the souls of the righteous, thus sequestered for a time, might at last be brought to the perfect fruition of happiness in heaven." (2) "Many of the ancients held the opinion

of the Millennium, and so prayed that the faithful departed might obtain a part in this resurrection." (3) "Many of the ancients believed that there would be a fire of probation through which all must pass at the last day, even the prophets and apostles, and even the Virgin Mary herself not excepted, which is asserted by Origen, Irenæus, and Lactantius, but also by St. Ambrose, who says, after Origen, 'that all must pass through the flames, though it be John the Evangelist; though it be Peter? The sons of Levi shall be purged by fire, Ezekiel, Daniel,'" etc. He quotes St. Hilary as follows: "If the Virgin herself, who conceived God in her womb, must undergo the severity of judgment, who is so bold as to desire to be judged by God?" Bingham goes on: "There are many like passages in Gregory Nazianzen, and Nyssen, and St. Jerome, and St. Austin, which the Romish writers commonly produce for the fire of purgatory, whereas they plainly refer to this 'purging sacrament,' as Origen calls it; or, in St. Austin's language, 'the purging pains of the fire of judgment at the last day.'" (4) Some of the Fathers believed that the prayers of the living might "mitigate the pains of the damned souls;" and he quotes St. Austin, St. Chrysostom, and Prudentius. Of course Bingham holds that the doctrine of the Church of England is identical with the doctrine of the Fathers and the early Church (*Antiq.*, vol. v. pp. 119–126).

I am writing away from my books, but I believe I am correct in saying that St. Austin is the first and only Father of the Primitive Church who deprecated prayers for the martyrs as incongruous, on the ground that their baptism of blood had washed out every stain of sin. But even immaculateness does not necessarily qualify for unclouded fruition of the Beatific Vision ; and Perrone labours in vain to prove that the current doctrine of the Church of Rome on the Intermediate State is in harmony with the teaching of St. Austin. The Roman doctrine, as contrasted with that of the Churches of the East and the Primitive Church, is thus tersely stated by Mr. William Palmer, in a work written while he was an Anglican, and not disowned after he joined the Church of Rome :—

"The doctrine of the Fathers and of the early Church, of the present Greek or Orthodox Church, and of all the other separated Eastern Churches, is this, that, generally speaking and upon the whole, the state of the faithful departed is a state of light, and rest, and peace, and refreshment, of happiness far greater than any belonging to this life, yet inferior to that which shall be enjoyed after the resurrection and the final judgment. The doctrine of the Latins, on the other hand, is this, that, generally speaking and upon the whole, the state of the faithful departed is a state of penal torment, differing from that of hell

only in the certainty of future deliverance" (*Dissertations on the Orthodox Communion*, p. 124).

This is a fair summary of the case, and Palmer is undoubtedly right in identifying "the doctrine of the Fathers and of the early Church" with that of Oriental Christendom at the present day; whereas the doctrine of the Roman Church, since the Council of Florence especially, is simply unknown to the early Church, East and West.

Probably no Englishman of our time had such complete mastery of the doctrine of the Eastern Church on all subjects as Mr. William Palmer, and he was also profoundly learned in the theology of Latin Christianity. But, indeed, it is not necessary to labour that point. The standard authorities of the Eastern and Western Churches confirm the accuracy of my quotation from Mr. Palmer. The question was referred to at the Bonn Conferences in 1874-75 as one of the differences between the Churches of the East and West. The Archpriest Janyscheff, one of the acutest and most learned divines in Russia, insisted on the importance of the difference on this point between the Church of Rome and Eastern Christendom; and he was supported by M. Ossinin, Professor of Theology in the Ecclesiastical Academy of St. Petersburg; by Professor Damalas of Athens; by Archbishop Lycurgos, and by all the Easterns present.

Janyscheff appealed to "The Longer Catechism of the Russian Church," to show that, according to the teaching of the Orthodox Church, the faithful departed did not enter heaven till after the general resurrection. The following is the passage to which he referred :—

"*Q.* In what state are the souls of the dead till the general resurrection ?"

"*A.* The souls of the righteous are in light and rest ; but the souls of the wicked are in a state the reverse of this."

"*Q.* Why may we not ascribe to the souls of the righteous perfect happiness immediately after death ?"

"*A.* Because it is ordained that the perfect retribution according to works shall be received by the perfect man after the resurrection of the body and God's last judgment."

"*Q.* Why do we ascribe to the souls of the righteous a foretaste of bliss before the last judgment ?"

"*A.* On the testimony of Jesus Christ Himself, who says in the parable that the righteous Lazarus was immediately after death carried into Abraham's bosom. St. Luke xvi. 22."

"*Q.* Is this foretaste of bliss joined with a sight of Christ's own countenance ?"

"*A.* It is so, more especially with the Saints, as we are given to understand by the Apostle Paul, who

had a desire to depart and to be with Christ. Philip. i. 23."

Moreover, in the Encyclical Letter, lately issued by the Eastern Church, in reply to the Pope's call to reunion, "the belief in a complete recompense of the just before the general resurrection and judgment" is pointed out as one of the innovations on the part of Rome which bar the reunion of Christendom.

Dr. Döllinger said at the Bonn Conference that he was familiar with this point of difference between the two Churches, but added that he did not know that the Easterns laid such emphasis upon it. With respect to the Roman doctrine of Purgatory, Dr. Döllinger agreed with the Easterns in rejecting it as an innovation on the doctrine of undivided Christendom: I mean the doctrine which represents Purgatory as a hell, differing only from the Inferno in point of duration. Of the Purgatorial fire Bellarmine says: "It is the common mind of theologians that it is true and proper fire, and of the same kind as our element." And he gives the volcanic fire of Ætna as an illustration (*De Purg.*, ii. 11).

Of this doctrine Faber says: "It loves to represent Purgatory simply as a hell which is not eternal. Violence, confusion, wailing, horror preside over its descriptions. It dwells, and truly, on the terribleness of the pain of sense which the soul is mysteriously permitted to endure. The fire is the same fire as

that of hell, created for the single and express purpose of giving torture" (*All for Jesus*, pp. 335–337).

To plunge innocent children and saintly adults into this indefinitely prolonged hell was too revolting to man's sense of natural justice; and as Purgatory was supposed to embrace the whole of the Intermediate State, this doctrine made it necessary that baptized infants and eminent saints should go straight from earth to heaven, being supposed to be "as the angels" in fitness for enjoyment of the Beatific Vision. It follows, of course, that prayers for them are as much out of place as prayers for the angels. Yet, in all the ancient Liturgies, prayers are offered for all the faithful departed without exception. Can there be a clearer proof that the Roman doctrine of Purgatory is inconsistent with the creed of undivided Christendom?

Nor, indeed, are Roman divines quite consistent with themselves and with each other on this subject. Saint Catherine of Genoa, and Cardinal Newman in his *Dream of Gerontius*, represent the pain of Purgatory as that of unsatisfied longing; pain caused by absence from the unclouded splendour of "the King in His beauty," yet glad acquiescence in that pain, since premature admission to the Beatific Vision would bring still greater pain. Few unprejudiced Christians, I imagine, would find much difficulty in receiving such a doctrine of Purgatory as that, if

they would only purge their minds of the popular notions associated with the word.

It is not easy to gather a clear and logical idea of the subject from the discussion of it by St. Thomas Aquinas, for he is hardly consistent with himself. He teaches that saints at death enjoy the Beatific Vision, and that St. Paul enjoyed it in the rapture or trance described in 2 Cor. xii. Yet he compares the Apostle's vision of God on that occasion with that enjoyed by Moses in Horeb (Exod. xxxiii.): *Talis fuit raptus Pauli et etiam Moysis: et satis congruenter, nam sicut Moyses fuit primus doctor Judæorum, ita Paulus fuit primus doctor gentium.* Clearly this was not the Beatific Vision in its strict theological sense. It was the afterglow of the Divine Majesty that Moses saw "in a clift of the rock" and "covered" with the hand of God while the Beatific Vision "passed by," which Moses could not "see and live." This incident in the life of the great Jewish lawgiver has always seemed to me a beautiful illustration of the condition of the faithful departed between death and the general resurrection. They are "in a clift of the rock;" shaded from the overpowering splendour of unveiled Deity while under the imperfection of disembodied existence, but enjoying such glimpses of that splendour as in their "unclothed" state they are able to bear.

Aquinas proceeds to describe a number of other differences between the rapture of St. Paul and the

Beatific Vision. So that it is by no means easy to understand what precise idea he meant to convey. His explanation of our Lord's promise to the penitent robber is still more perplexing. This is partly due to the notion then prevalent, that there are two paradises — a terrestrial paradise (sometimes called *infernum*) in the interior of this earth; and a spiritual Paradise where the saints enjoy the Beatific Vision. It was into "the terrestrial and corporeal paradise," according to Aquinas, that the robber descended; and our Lord's promise on the Cross was thus fulfilled, because the robber in the earthly Paradise "enjoyed Christ's divinity."[1] How forced and non-natural this explanation is will appear the moment one remembers that the robber "enjoyed the divinity of Christ" on the Cross; for the divinity is ubiquitous. But our Lord's promise cannot refer to His presence with the robber on the Cross, for the promise is future. Nor can it refer to heaven, the sphere of the Beatific Vision, for it points to the period immediately after death; and Christ did not enter heaven in His glorified Humanity for six weeks afterwards. The truth is that St. Thomas found the specifically Roman doctrine of Purgatory in practical possession of the See of Rome, and he did his best to reconcile it with Holy Scripture. The forged Decretals were then honestly believed through-

[1] Summa, Pars III., Q. lii., Art. IV.

out the West, and St. Thomas dutifully accepted, as of supreme authority, the whole body of doctrine which he found flourishing under Papal sanction. Under all the circumstances, it is perhaps not surprising that his usual lucidity of reasoning somewhat forsakes him in his discussion of this subject.

Peter Lombard, a name scarcely inferior to St. Thomas in scholastic theology, is far more reserved in this matter. In discussing the question, *Si eis (spiritibus defunctorum) potest sine corporibus summa beatitudo præberi*, he says: "Difficilis quæstio est, nec potest a nobis perfecte definiri. Sed tamen dubium non est, et raptam a carnis sensibus hominis mentem, et post mortem ipsa carne deposita non sic videre posse incommutabilem substantiam, id est, Deum, sicut sancti angeli vidunt, sive alia latentiori causa, sive ideo quia inest ei naturalis quidam appetitus corpus administrandi, quo retardatur quodammodo, nec tota intentione pergat in illud summum cœlum, donec ille appetitus conquiescat. Porro si tale sit corpus, cujus sit difficilis et gravis administratio, sicut hæc caro quæ corrumpitur, multo magis avertitur mens ab illa visione summi cœli. Proinde cum hoc corpus jam non animale, sed spirituale receperit æquata angelis, habebit perfectum naturæ suæ modum, obediens et imperans, vivificatur et vivificans, tam ineffabili facilitate, ut sit ei gloriæ quod fuit sarcinæ" (*De Sacram*, lib. iv. Distinct. xlix. s. 5).

Dante, who accepts the mediæval eschatology, divides his paradise into the terrestrial paradise, which is on the summit of the Mount of Purgatory, and the celestial paradise, which consists of nine spheres and, above and embracing them all, the Empyrean—the sphere of the Beatific Vision. In the nine spheres of the celestial paradise are the souls of saints in varying degrees of imperfection and development. In the Empyrean alone is the Beatific Vision, which Dante is supernaturally allowed to see in one moment of intuition, in which an eternity is condensed. What he beholds is three circles of equal circumference and threefold colour, but exhibiting only one form—the Divine-human countenance of the Incarnate Son—

> "Dentro da sé del suo colore stesso
> Mi parve pinta della nostra effige."

In brief, the Biblical and patristic view of redeemed human life in its totality divides it into three cosmical spheres. First, the present sphere, ἐν σαρκή, whose prevailing bias is submission to the sensible and material; secondly, the intermediate state, ἐν πνεύματι, the sphere of incorporeal soul-life, a sphere of infinitely varied ethical and spiritual condition and progressive development; lastly, the post-resurrection period, when the soul shall be clothed with the σῶμα πνευματικον, in place of the σῶμα ψυχικὸν, and there shall be the full fruition of the Beatific Vision.

This is plainly St. Paul's doctrine, as when he says: "If this earthly house," *i.e.* the natural body, "be destroyed, we have an eternal, a heavenly habitation, whose maker is God," *i.e.* the resurrection body. And he represents the intervening period between the two bodies as one of nudity, the absence of that spiritual integumant which is as essential to the integrity of man in heaven as the material body was to his integrity on earth, and without which the soul cannot enjoy its predestined heritage.

No doctrine can be built on the mere use of the word "heaven," either in the Bible or in patristic literature, for it is used in various senses, and in the Bible almost invariably in the plural, indicating different spheres of spiritual life, as I have explained in the sermons on "The Many Mansions." The word "paradise," on the other hand, is used in the Bible in a sense invariably exclusive of the highest heaven. Rev. ii. 7 is sometimes quoted as an exception. But, in the first place, the reference is figurative, and evidently not a statement of fact; and, in the second place, the figure excludes heaven in the specific sense of this discussion. The analogy requires that the paradise of Rev. ii. 7 should be—like the paradise of Gen. ii. 9—a place of preparation for heaven: therefore not heaven itself.

To sum up. The ancient Church, East and West, divided the unseen realm into three states. (1) The

highest heaven, where God is seen in unclouded majesty. Into this disembodied spirits do not enter; they must wait to be "clothed upon" with the spiritual body. (2) Hades, which was divided into a place of torment, as in the case of Dives, and into paradise, as in the case of Lazarus. (3) Gehenna. Into paradise passed all souls who died in grace, but in every degree of ethical and spiritual development, from the brand snatched from the burning to the mature saint; each going to his own place —to the mansion prepared for his special need. In this intermediate state there was progress for all, and visitation of angels, and such measure of the Divine glory as was suited to the capacity of each.

No doubt "heaven" and "paradise" are sometimes used loosely and rhetorically as convertible terms by some ancient writers. But the essential point is that the faithful departed are represented as being in an intermediate state, suited to the spiritual condition of each, and preparatory to the highest heaven after the resurrection. And the word "paradise" implies this. It is a Persian word, meaning a pleasure park, and especially the park belonging to a royal palace, where the King may be seen occasionally. But his throne is in the palace, and it is there he holds his court. Eden was such a paradise, visited by the Divine Presence in man's

state of innocence ; an abode preparatory to his translation in due time to the interior of the palace.

I have ventured to offer this explanation because I have lately learned, with much surprise, that a certain number of our own and of the American clergy have not only adopted the extreme Roman doctrine on the subject of the Intermediate State, but have strangely persuaded themselves, in addition, that this is, as one of them has expressed it, "the faith of Christendom"—the received doctrine of the Church of England, barring a few ill-instructed High Churchmen—as well as of all the Churches of Eastern Christendom.

I will give here one crucial illustration of the fallacies which pervade the whole reasoning of these writers. I had in a letter to the *Church Times* appealed to the extract from "The Longer Catechism of the Russian Church," which I have quoted on a previous page, by way of proof that the Orthodox Church held the doctrine which I have endeavoured to explain in this Preface. It is said in that extract that the faithful departed have in the Intermediate State "a sight of Christ's own countenance," and are "with Christ" in the sense in which St. Paul "desired to depart and to be with Christ." From this one of my critics concluded that to be "with Christ" is of necessity to be in the highest heaven. "Canon MacColl's quotation from the Russian Catechism,"

he says, "goes to prove our point, not his—viz. that, although the saints await their perfect consummation, they are already 'with Christ.' Christ is at the right hand of God in glory." This style of reasoning would prove that St. Stephen was in heaven when he "saw the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God;" and St. Paul, when he "saw a light from heaven above the brightness of the sun," and heard the voice of Jesus speaking to him in the Hebrew tongue.

All this kind of reasoning rests on a material basis. It assumes that the laws of the spiritual world and the faculties of its inhabitants are identical with ours, or at least similar to them. The probability is that they are of a totally different kind. And, indeed, some of the recent discoveries of modern science prove that there are, even within the sphere of mundane matter, marvellous possibilities which, if they had been found predicted in the Bible, would have been scoffed at as absurdities. Our Lord's passing in His glorified body through closed doors, for example, has been for centuries scoffed at as an absurd and impossible myth. But the latest discovery in photography has demonstrated its possibility. For if light, which is a material substance, can penetrate, as if they did not exist, opaque and solid substances, like wood and aluminium and flesh and muscle, *à fortiori* may the much subtler substance

of a spiritual body do so. To spiritual beings, moreover, there is probably nothing corresponding to what we mean by distance. They do not travel by locomotion; like thought, they are instantaneously where they wish to be. Nearness to, or distance from, Christ would therefore, for such beings, have no relation to locality or space, but only to spiritual perception. The fissure which enabled the proto-martyr or the Apostle to see or hear Christ "at the right hand of God" was not in "the heavens," but in their own material organisms. The latent powers of the human spirit were enabled to pierce material obstacles as if they did not exist, and to perceive the presence of the Son of Man in glory, always near us, although we are unable to apprehend it under the limitations of our present condition.

Holy Scripture and the discoveries of modern science coincide in teaching that the more any substance approaches the realm of spirit the less is it impeded by the ordinary laws of matter. The force of attraction is independent of distance and of any mass of gross matter that may lie between the attracting atoms. Two atoms attract each other on opposite sides of the globe as if nothing lay between. If particles of dead matter are thus cognizant of each without regard to distance or intervening obstacles, does it not follow, *à fortiori*, that pure spirit is even more independent of matter?

A late president of the British Association, a distinguished lawyer as well as man of science, says, in his most interesting *Correlation of Physical Forces*, that "myriads of organized beings may exist, imperceptibly to our vision, even if we were among them." And it is a truism of physical science that impressions on the atmosphere as well as on the ocean are indelible; that as every ripple on the sea is imperishable, so every motion of the atmosphere caused by our idle words remain printed in indelible characters, and probably legible to higher organisms than ourselves. Some readers will remember how vividly Babbage draws this out in his eloquent, but unfortunately unfinished, *Bridgwater Treatise*. And what a terrible significance it adds to our Lord's declaration that "for every idle word that men shall speak" they will have to render an account!

The phenomena consequent on the grand eruption of Krakatoa in 1883 have shed a good deal of light on this subject. Some astonishing facts are recorded in a most interesting volume published under the auspices of the Royal Society. The air-waves varied in rapidity from 13 hrs. 48 min. to 124 hrs. 30 min. in passing between Krakatoa and Kew, according, I suppose, to the difference in the violence of the explosions. But what is, perhaps, the most surprising fact of all to the imagination is that the sound of the explosions was heard "very nearly three thousand

English miles from Krakatoa." "Several times during the night" (of the eruption), says the account, "reports were heard coming from the eastward, like the distant roar of heavy guns."

"At Diego Garcia, upwards of two thousand five hundred miles from Krakatoa, the sounds were very distinctly heard, and were supposed to be those of guns fired by a vessel in distress. In Ceylon, and also in Australia, the sounds were heard at many different places far removed from each other, while at Dorey, in New Guinea, they were clearly heard, and their occurrence was recorded at the time, long before it was known to what cause they were due" (*The Eruption of Krakatoa and Subsequent Phenomena*, pp. 79, 80).

The light with which the researches of modern science have irradiated the Scripture revelations of a future state is to me as marvellous and instructive as it is fascinating. And it is because I have often found the prevalent notions on that subject so vague and shadowy that I have endeavoured in this volume and elsewhere to show that the spiritual world embraces and interpenetrates this, and that departed souls, and *à fortiori* our Lord's glorified humanity, are not only not separated from us by distance of space—for pure spirit has no relation to distance in space—but that they are infinitely more alive and energetic than they were under the conditions of

mortality, and find employment for all their powers in a degree inconceivable here. And is there anything in reason or Scripture to forbid our believing that spirits emancipated from the gross integument of a physical body may be *en rapport*, in ways we cannot imagine, with human beings in this world, and especially with those to whom they are united by bonds of sympathy? Were not the souls under the altar conscious of the sufferings of their brethren on earth? And surely Hebrews xii. 1, though embracing the idea of martyrs, suggests primarily the idea of a crowd of encompassing spectators (περικείμενον νέφος), as in the semicircle of an amphitheatre: θεαταί, but also μάρτυρες, who had borne witness to God on earth, and were themselves μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως; being now witnesses of their brethren still struggling in the arena.

One of my critics quoted Heb. xii. 22–24 in proof of his assertion that the faithful departed pass into the highest heaven at the moment of death. The truth, however, is that the text is quite irrelevant to this discussion. It is simply a terse statement of the doctrine of the Communion of Saints. The inspired writer contemplates the Church Militant and the Church Triumphant proleptically as one body, just as we do ourselves in the Trisagion in the Eucharistic Service. By a parity of reasoning my critic would be obliged to argue that all the baptized are even here in

the full enjoyment of the Beatific Vision; for it is of them that the author of the Epistle says: "But ye *are* come (προσεληλύθατε) to Mount Sion," etc. This shows the danger of drawing general conclusions from isolated expressions. Even the term "Beatific Vision" may be loosely used to describe the happiness of saints in paradise—*i.e.* in the Intermediate State. For every vision of the divine glory, even that of Moses "in a clift of the rock" on Horeb, as Aquinas admits, may be truly described as "beatific." It is a question of degree. Even in heaven angels and glorified saints perceive and enjoy more or less of what is implied by the Beatific Vision in proportion to the greater or less degree of their several capacities. For the purpose of this discussion I have used the term "Beatific Vision" as meaning some supernatural manifestation of the Godhead, through the Incarnate Son, which is only vouchsafed in that heaven into which our Lord will invite His own in the Last Day, in the words: "Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." It is plain that this implies a higher sphere of being and of enjoyment than the disembodied state even of the highest saints. I cannot understand how there can be any doubt about it. The Primitive Church had none.

I have already quoted Bingham's exposition of

the patristic and Anglican doctrine on the condition of the faithful departed between death and the general resurrection. But as I find that a number of our younger clergy, who have apparently taken their theology neither from the Fathers nor from the Anglican divines, but from the Ultramontane Perrone of the Collegio Romano, boldly preach the Roman doctrine as "the faith of Christendom" in general, and of the Church of England in particular, I will conclude with an epitome of Jeremy Taylor's statement of the true doctrine in his splendid "Funeral Sermon" on Sir George Dalstone.[1] According to Perrone, "it is *de fide* in the Church of Rome since Benedict XII. and the Council of Florence, that the souls of the just, 'without waiting for the resurrection of their bodies or the Day of Judgment, enjoy the Beatific Vision the moment they leave the body.'" But, better informed than his Anglican disciples, he does not say that this is "the faith of Christendom" outside the Roman Communion; on the contrary, he says that "most of the Greeks, since the Photian schism," hold the doctrine which I am here defending. But it was not the Greeks, it was the Romans, who departed from what was the universal doctrine of Christendom down to "the Photian schism." "The error" of the Greeks, says Perrone, "was taken up by Luther and Calvin (*sacrorum emendatores!*), but

[1] *Works*, vol. viii. p. 543. Eden's edition.

had nearly fallen into oblivion, until it was revived in the last century by Burnet, whose work is widely disseminated among Protestants."[1] This amazing travesty of ecclesiastical history was lately repeated by an English clergyman in controversy with me on the subject.

The following are the salient points of Jeremy Taylor's argument. His text is 1 Cor. xv. 19: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." "This means," argues Taylor, "that unless there be a resurrection, there is no good for us anywhere else." For—

"If the godly, instantly upon their dissolution, had the vision beatifical, it is very true that they were not most miserable, though there be no resurrection of the dead; for the joys of the sight of God would, in the soul alone, make them infinite recompense for all the sufferings of this world. But that which the saints have after their dissolution being only the comforts of a holy hope, the argument remains good."

He goes on to show that—

"This was the undoubted sentence of the Jews before Christ and since; and therefore our blessed Saviour told the converted thief that he should 'that day be with Him in paradise.' Now without peradventure He spake so as He was to be understood;

[1] Perrone's *Prælectiones Theologicæ*, vol. i. pp. 818, 819.

meaning by paradise that which the schools and pulpits of the Rabbis did usually speak of it."

"By paradise, till the time of Esdras," the Jews meant the Garden of Eden in which Adam and Eve were placed. But, from the time of Esdras, "they called the state of souls expecting the resurrection of their bodies, by the name of 'the Garden of Eden.'"

From the case of the penitent thief Jeremy Taylor passes to "the raptures of St. Paul," and argues tha. "St. Paul, being a Jew and speaking after the manner of his nation, makes paradise a distinct thing from 'the third heaven.'" After some more illustrations, he says—

"All comes from the same fountain, the doctrine of the old synagogue, confirmed by the words of Christ and the commentaries of the Apostle, viz. that after death, before the Day of Judgment, there is a paradise for God's servants, a region of rest, of comfort, and holy expectations. . . . This place of separation was called paradise by the Jews, and by Christ, and after Christ's ascension by St. John, because it signifies a place of pleasure and rest."

But—

"Although the state of separation may now also, and is by St. John, called paradise, because the allegory still holds perfectly, as signifying comfort and holy pleasures; yet the spirits of good men are not to be said to be with Abraham, but to be with

Christ; and, as being with Abraham was the specification of the more general word of paradise in the Old Testament; so being with Christ is the specification of it in the New."

He goes on to quote St. Stephen, St. Paul, St. Polycarp, and St. Jerome, to show that "to be with Christ" meant paradise, not heaven.

"Upon this account (and it is not at all unreasonable) the Church hath conjectured that the state of separate souls since the glorification of our Lord is much bettered and advanced, and their comforts greater. . . . This improvement of their condition is well intimated by their being said to be 'under the altar,' that is, under the protection of Christ and the powers and benefits of His priesthood, by which He makes continual intercession both for them and us."

"I am bound to admonish this also, that although our blessed Saviour is in the creed said to descend, εἰς ἅδου, 'into hell,' so we render it; yet this does not at all prejudice His other words, 'This day shalt thou be with Me in paradise;' for the word εἰς ἅδου signifies indefinitely the state of separation, whether blessed or accursed; it means only 'the invisible place,' or the region of darkness, whither whoso descends shall be no more seen. For as among the heathens the Elysian fields and *Tartara* are both ἐν ἅδῃ, so amongst the Jews and Christians *paradise* and *gehenna* are the distinct states of *hades*. . . .

"I have now made it as evident as questions of this nature will bear, that in the state of separation the spirits of good men shall be blessed and happy souls. They have an antepast or taste of their reward; but their great reward itself, their crown of righteousness, shall not be yet; that shall not be till the Day of Judgment. . . . At His glorious appearing we shall appear glorious; we shall see Him as He is; but till then this beautiful vision shall not be at all."

"But what do they in the mean time? how is it with them? . . . They rejoice and are delighted in a wonderful manner. 'They see angels and archangels, they converse with them, and see our blessed Saviour Jesus in His glorified humanity.' So Justin. But in these great joys they look for greater. They are now *in paradise;* but they long that the body and soul may be in heaven together; but this is the glory of the Day of Judgment, the fruit of the resurrection. And this whole affair is agreeable to reason and the analogy of the whole dispensation, as it is generally and particularly described in Scripture."

"The sum is this: in the world we walk by faith, in the state of separation we live by hope, and in the resurrection we shall live by an eternal charity. Here we see God as in a glass darkly; in the separation we shall behold Him, but it is afar off; and after the resurrection we shall see Him face to face, in

the everlasting comprehensions of an intuitive beatitude. In this life we are warriors; in the separation we are conquerors; but we shall not triumph till after the resurrection."

"This doctrine, though of late it hath been laid aside, upon the interest of the Church of Rome, and for compliance with some other schools, yet was it universally the doctrine of the primitive church. . . . Concerning which I shall not need to heap up testimonies; this only, it is the doctrine of the Greek Church unto this day, and was the opinion of the greatest part of the ancient Church, both Latin and Greek, and by degrees was in the West eaten out by the doctrine of purgatory and invocation of saints, and rejected a little above two hundred years ago in the Council of Florence, and since that time it hath been more generally taught"—*i.e.* in the Latin Church —"that the souls of good men enjoy the Beatific Vision before the resurrection, even presently upon the dissolution. According to which new opinion it will be impossible to understand the meaning of my text, and of divers other places of Scripture, which I have now alleged and explicated, or at all to perceive the economy and dispensation of the Day of Judgment, or how it can be a judgment;" "and it can mean nothing but to them that are alive, and then it is but a particular and not a universal judgment, and after all, it can pretend to no piety, to no

Scripture, to no reason, and only can serve the ends of the Church of Rome, who can no better way be confuted in their invocations of saints than by this truth, that the saints do not yet enjoy the Beatific Vision, and though they are in a state of ease and comfort, yet are not in a state of power and glory and kingdom till the day of judgment."

I trust, therefore, that if any of our clergy will still persist in holding and preaching the Roman doctrine, they will at least be careful to acknowledge that it is neither primitive, nor Anglican, nor Greek, but is exclusively Roman, and not universally accepted by all even in the Church of Rome.

It was mainly in deference to the advice of my friend Mr. R. H. Hutton that I published these sermons from newspaper reports of them. Mr. Hutton kindly revised the proof sheets, and carelessly passed, as I did myself, a striking passage from a remarkable Essay by himself. Not having a copy of his Essays with me here, I cannot give the reference; but I have written to ask Mr. Hutton himself to be so kind as to send it to my publishers, with the proper marks of quotation.

M. M'C.

ROME,
Lent, 1896.

CONTENTS

I.

AGNOSTICISM.

PAGE

"*For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse.*"—ROM. i. 20 1

An Advent Address preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, 1876.

II.

I.—IMMORTALITY AND THE DOCTRINE OF EVOLUTION.

"*Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.*"—2 PET. iii. 13 21

III.

II.—IMMORTALITY AND THE DOCTRINE OF EVOLUTION.

"*Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.*"—2 PET. iii. 13 32

IV.

III.—IMMORTALITY AND THE DOCTRINE OF EVOLUTION.

PAGE

"*Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.*"—2 PET. iii. 13 49

V.

I.—THE MANY MANSIONS OF THE SPIRITUAL REALM.

"*In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.*"—JOHN xiv. 2 71

Preached in Ripon Cathedral, on the First Sunday in Advent, 1893.

VI.

II.—THE MANY MANSIONS OF THE SPIRITUAL REALM.

"*In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.*"—JOHN xiv. 2 85

Preached in Ripon Cathedral, on the Second Sunday in Advent, 1893.

VII.

III.—THE MANY MANSIONS OF THE SPIRITUAL REALM.

"*In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.*"—JOHN xiv. 2 101

Preached in Ripon Cathedral, on the Fourth Sunday in Advent, 1893.

VIII.

IV.—THE MANY MANSIONS OF THE SPIRITUAL REALM.

PAGE

"*In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.*"—JOHN xiv. 2 116

Preached in Ripon Cathedral, on the First Sunday after Christmas, 1893.

IX.

THE HIDDEN TREASURE.

"*Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.*"—MATT. vi. 19–21 140

X.

PURITY OF HEART THE CONDITION OF SEEING GOD.

"*Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.*"—MATT. v. 8 157

Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday evening, August 17, 1890.

XI.

MYSTERY A MARK OF GOD'S WORK.

"*Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.*"—MATT. v. 8 174

Preached in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, Christmas Day, 1886.

XII.

HOW TO MEET TEMPTATION.

PAGE

"*Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego answered and said to the king, O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and He will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.*"—DAN. iii. 16–18 . . 186

XIII.

THE SECRET OF DANIEL'S HEROISM.

"*Now when Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house; and his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime.*"—DAN. vi. 10 198

XIV.

NAAMAN THE SYRIAN.

"*Now Naaman, captain of the host of the king of Syria, was a great man with his master, and honourable, because by him the Lord had given deliverance unto Syria: he was also a mighty man in valour, but he was a leper.*"—2 KINGS v. 1 . . . 215

XV.

THE "LITTLE MAID" OF ISRAEL.

"*And the Syrians had gone out by companies, and had brought away captive out of the land of Israel a little maid, and she waited on Naaman's wife.*"—2 KINGS v. 2 233

Preached at the Children's Service in Ripon Cathedral, on Sunday, November 12, 1893.

XVI.

THE MIRACLE OF THE LOAVES.

PAGE

"*When they were filled, He said unto His disciples, Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost. Therefore they gathered them together, and filled twelve baskets with the fragments of the five barley loaves, which remained over and above unto them that had eaten.*"—JOHN vi. 12, 13 247

XVII.

THE SIN OF WASTE.

"*When they were filled, He said unto His disciples, Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost.*"—JOHN vi. 12 262

XVIII.

THE DANGER OF PARTY SPIRIT.

"*And when He was come into Jerusalem, all the city was moved, saying, Who is this?*"—MATT. xxi. 10 276

XIX.

CAPITAL AND LABOUR.

"*See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil.*"—EPH. v. 15, 16 290

XX.

THE DOCTRINE OF FORGIVENESS AS TAUGHT BY CHRIST.

"*Then came Peter to Him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times; but, Until seventy times seven.*"—MATT. xviii. 21, 22 . . 313

XXI.

A VENTURE OF FAITH.

PAGE

"*And Simon answering said unto Him, Master, we have toiled all the night, and have taken nothing: nevertheless at Thy word I will let down the net.*"—LUKE v. 5 325

XXII.

SEEKING THE LIVING AMONG THE DEAD.

"*And as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead?*"—LUKE xxiv. 5 343

XXIII.

IGNORANT PRAYERS.

"*But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask.*"—MATT. xx. 22 354

Preached the Sunday after the death of the Grand Duchess of Hesse (Princess Alice).

APPENDICES 371

I.

AGNOSTICISM.

"*For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse.*"—ROM. i. 20.

THE subject upon which I have been asked to address you this evening is one for a book rather than a sermon. Of course, therefore, you will not expect me to do more, in the limited time at my disposal, than indicate in the rough a few lines of thought which may perchance be of use to such as have not leisure or opportunity to prove for themselves the invalidity of some of the popular objections to Christianity. And it may be well to begin by clearing out of the way one or two misconceptions.

1. It is supposed by many that an orthodox Christian is bound by his creed to believe that no one who rejects that creed can be saved. Some

ill-instructed Christians may hold that opinion, for belief in Christianity does not secure the human mind from error; but no Christian is bound to hold, or is right in holding, it. The Athanasian Creed, indeed, does make salvation conditional on a right belief. But what do we mean by being "saved"? Not mere admission into a certain place called heaven. To be saved is to have our nature trained to realize its ideal—to reach the utmost perfection of which it is capable in a world where all its powers shall have fair play. This world is not such a place. We believe that heaven is. To be fit for heaven, therefore, is to be saved, and the training necessary for the purpose is moral rather than intellectual. Now it is a truism that character is influenced by the object of worship. We grow into the likeness of what we habitually adore. If the God we worship be a perfect Being, the attraction of His example will of necessity lure His worshippers on towards perfection. But if He be less than perfect, the character of the worshipper cannot realize its ideal, cannot reach the standard of excellence of which it is potentially capable: its development will be arrested; perhaps even perverted. Much more is this the case if the object of worship be not only negatively imperfect, but positively evil or sinful.

Now the God whom the Christian worships embodies the highest idea of perfection of which the human mind is capable. It is the Divine Nature manifested in a perfectly sinless and flawless human character. The Divine Nature alone is too unlike the human, too remote from finite humanity, to be an adequate object of imitation. On the other hand, human nature alone, even in its highest personifications, is too imperfect and limited to serve as the Ideal of our aspiration—as our Pattern Man. We need a Mediator, one who can bridge the space which separates the creature from the creator; who can touch the divinity with one hand and the humanity with the other, thus bringing the two natures into communion with each other. The worshippers of such a Being must obviously "go on to perfection:" there can be no limit to the development of their nature. But since the worshipper grows into the likeness of what he worships, it is surely plain that a right belief—that is, a true conception of the God he worships—must have an important bearing on man's future destiny. He who believes Jesus of Nazareth to be only man cannot have his character moulded in the same way as the man who believes Him to be God as well. It is impossible to be affected in the same way, and therefore fashioned after the same

pattern, by fundamentally different modes of faith and worship. It follows, therefore, that a man's salvation is closely connected with his religious belief, not by God's arbitrary appointment, but by the natural operation of the laws of human nature. Our happiness here and hereafter depends on our being in harmony with our surroundings. But a man who discards altogether the idea of God and all that it implies, or who has cherished a false idea, has so far disqualified himself for the life of heaven; in much the same way in which a traveller, intending to settle in a distant land, would disqualify himself by acquiring habits unsuited to its climate and pursuits, and incapacitating him for understanding the language of its population and obeying their laws.

Suppose, then, the case of a man who passes out of this life a disbeliever in Christianity, or even in God. His condition in the next world would depend on the state of his will rather than of his knowledge. There are two kinds of ignorance: ignorance which comes of a man's own fault, and ignorance for which the man himself is not responsible; and the ignorance approaches innocence or guilt in the degree in which it is or is not self-caused. Now all the mass of subtle influences which go to the formation of character are known to God alone, and He alone can weigh the

responsibility of the will in any particular case. A man may have rejected Christianity because the form in which it was presented to him justly revolted his moral sense. To proclaim Christianity, for instance, as a universal religion, the Author of which arbitrarily selected a minority of the human race for everlasting happiness, and doomed the rest to everlasting misery, is to offend at once our reason and our sense of eternal justice; and the man who rejects such a religion does not reject Christianity, though he may think he does. He is therefore guiltless. What he has rejected is not Christianity, but a libellous perversion of Christianity. He is in error, but not in wilful error.

Again: a man's faith in Christianity may be shaken by witnessing the startling contrast between the profession and practice of Christians in general, or of some particular Christian with whom he may be intimate. He admires his friend's character and trusts him implicitly. But he travels with him and finds him mean, selfish, hypocritical; or transacts business with him and finds him untruthful and dishonest; and the shock of this sudden revelation so upsets him that he relaxes his hold on Christianity and gradually falls away from the Faith. An unreasonable consequence undoubtedly; for the evil lives of Christians are no valid objection to Christianity;

indeed, they may be used as an argument in its favour. For it may be argued that a religion which has not only survived so long the evil lives of the mass of its professors, but has in addition undeniably placed the races, which yield allegiance to it, immeasurably in advance of the rest of mankind, and shows no sign of decrepitude at the close of the nineteenth century of its chequered career, can hardly be less than divine. But to be illogical is not necessarily to be guilty of the moral offence of rejecting a Divine revelation. Only He who knows all the circumstances, and can read our secret thoughts, can here draw the line where innocence ends and guilt begins.

2. The case is the same with respect to morals. The will of many a miserable outcast of society may be more right in the sight of God than that of multitudes of reputable Christians who would deem themselves defiled by contact with one of those outcasts. Our Lord warned the religious classes of His day that "the publicans and harlots" were nearer the kingdom of God than the most religious and highly exemplary leaders of society. God regards not so much what a man does as what he is. It is not the outward acts which are open to human valuation that He considers, but the key in which the character habitually moves and energizes. Neither in the

sphere of faith or morals, therefore, are we justified in passing a final judgment on any human being—not on the grossest criminal or the most offensive heretic. "The Judge of all the earth," and He alone, has a right to pass a final sentence on any one, for He alone is in possession of the whole evidence, and is alone infallible in His judgment.

But because all this is true it does not follow in the least that it is not better to be a Christian than an unbeliever, or to be of good report than to be an outcast of society. It is not the comparative merits of different classes of men that I wish to bring before you in the remarks that follow, but rather the comparative bearing on human life and character of Agnosticism and Christianity respectively.

The first requisite in any discussion is to understand clearly the meaning of the terms we use. What, then, do we mean by Agnosticism? It is the attitude of mind of persons who say that they have no evidence sufficient to convince them that there is a God. They resent the appellation of Atheist, because they do not profess to affirm positively that there is no God: they simply do not know that there is, and think it highly probable that there is not. It is only fair, as well as courteous, to accept a controversialist's statement of his own position. We

are therefore bound to start from the definition of Agnosticism which authoritative exponents of Agnosticism, like Professor Huxley, the late Professor Tyndall, and Mr. Herbert Spencer have given us; and it is such as I have described it.

Yet, surely, it may be doubted whether there is practically much difference between the mental attitude of an Atheist and the mental attitude of an Agnostic; and in matter of fact their arguments converge to the same point, and arrive at much the same result. If an Agnostic were to pray at all, and be at the same time logical, he would have to implore mercy in the words: "O God (if there be a God), have mercy on my soul (if I have a soul)." For the Agnostic is as sceptical about the existence of a future life as he is about the existence of God. But it is impossible to go on praying to a mere Perhaps, on behalf of a mere Perhaps, and I should imagine that no man can be a convinced Agnostic for any long time without ceasing to pray.

An Agnostic then, strictly speaking, is a person who professes to know nothing about the existence of God, or of man after death; but thinks it probable, on the whole, that man does not survive death, and that there is no Personal Intelligent Will behind the phenomena of the visible creation. That is the

meaning of Agnosticism properly so called. But leading Agnostics claim more than this. They do not simply profess their own ignorance as to whether there is a God or not; they affirm positively that such knowledge is impossible to man. But if they know that such knowledge is impossible they are no longer Agnostics, they are dogmatic professors of nescience; and that, as I have said, comes practically to the same thing as avowed Atheism. For if we know assuredly that we never shall know whether there is a God, there is no room for hope or faith, which are the mainspring of conduct. There is, of course, a sense in which the most devout Christian is an Agnostic—the sense in which Job asked and answered: "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? Deeper than hell; what canst thou know?" That is the true Agnosticism—a modest avowal of inability to comprehend God in the fulness of His infinite perfection, combined with a readiness to accept thankfully as much knowledge of Him as He vouchsafes to give through the various channels by which He has been pleased to reveal Himself. The spurious Agnosticism is that which asserts the impossibility of any knowledge at all on the subject.

Now, which is more in harmony with reason and experience—the Agnostic or the Christian theory of human life?

1. Surely Agnosticism must necessarily, and in the long run, be less favourable than Christianity to the development of the moral and intellectual faculties. Experience shows that an ideal always in advance of human effort is needful for mental and moral progress. "They that deny a God," says Bacon, "destroy man's nobility; for certainly man is akin to the beasts by his body; and if he be not akin to God by his spirit, he is a base and ignoble creature. It destroys likewise magnanimity and the raising of human nature; for take an example of a dog, and mark what generosity and courage he will put on when he finds himself maintained by a man, who to him is instead of a God or higher nature; which courage is manifestly such as that creature, without that confidence of a better nature than his own, could never obtain. So man, when he resteth and assureth himself upon Divine protection and favour, gathereth a force and faith which human nature in itself could never obtain."[1] Holding that the human mind is in direct contact with no higher mind, but is only the latest and highest consummation of forces pushing upwards from a lower

[1] Essay on "Atheism."

stage of existence, the Agnostic cannot regard his own highest faculties—reason, love, conscience, and so forth —as having an illumination apart from physical forces, as skylights to let in upon human nature an infinite dawn from above; but rather as a polished arch or dome, completing and reflecting the whole edifice beneath. To him the highest point of human culture is necessarily the highest point in the intellectual universe. Hard, blank, non-existence roofs us all in beyond; and of course therefore the highest faculties we possess must derive all their validity and meaning from the lower nature to which they add the finishing touch. The Agnostic is thus logically bound to look *down* instead of *up*, since, in his belief, his origin is from below, not from above. From dust he came—not in his body only, but in all his faculties—and to dust he will return and cease to be. A cheerless future truly for such a being as man, with his far-reaching aims, his splendid achievements, and his unquenchable hopes!

The Agnostic, however, consoles himself with the reflection that, though the individual may perish, the race survives and advances. But what is the race but a collection of individuals? And if these perish in rapid succession, is it not a mere playing with words to speak of the advance of the race? What signifies

that advance to each generation that flits across the scene and disappears for ever?

2. Again: to doubt the existence of a righteous, eternal God is to doubt the existence of an eternal right and wrong. And the Agnostic goes the full length of that doubt. With him right and wrong are not matters of eternal and immutable morality, but of social evolution only. His view is that men found out gradually, and by painful experience, that honesty, truthfulness, conventional chastity, respect for life and property, and the like, were essential to the well-being of society, and therefore men surrounded these virtues with the sanctions of law and religion. It follows of course, on that view, that these virtues have no character of their own at all, and that their opposites would be equally praiseworthy if they could be proved to be equally conducive to man's temporal interests. But if you convince mankind in general that there is no inherent and fundamental distinction between virtue and vice; that it is all a matter of social convenience; why should men abstain from indulging in such vices as are not punishable by law? Lying, unchastity, intemperance, gluttony, bad temper, backbiting, uncharitableness, dishonesty, may all be practised within the law; and even illegal offences may often be committed with impunity. Why should they not, if there is no

radical difference, no difference in the eternal nature of things, between virtue and vice; if, in a word, there is no such thing as sin? The world has hitherto had no experience of any society based on Agnostic principles; but our experience of the ordinary working of human motives justifies the belief that a society so constituted could not long hold together. Good men here and there might rise superior to the logical outcome of the system; but the innate selfishness of human nature would be too much for the multitude.

And how shall we explain remorse and secret shame for wrong-doing (when there is no danger of detection) with the theory of right and wrong being merely a matter of evolutional development? A dog that has done wrong will meet his master with a look of fear and shame, but will feel nothing of the kind in his master's absence. No more would man if his morality were not different in kind from the morality of a dog;[1] if he did not feel that right and wrong were eternally distinct in their own natures, so that neither could by any possibility pass into the other. People may differ in matter of fact as to what is right and

[1] A distinguished Agnostic once remarked to Dr. Liddon, "I could never accept the religion of a dog; I own no master." Is that avowal consistent with the profession of Agnosticism? If that gentleman knew that he had no master, he was not entitled to call himself an Agnostic.

wrong. Nations and individuals may think that right which other nations and individuals may think wrong. But the point is that mankind universally believe in the major premiss—that there is such a thing as right and wrong—though they may err as to the minor. It is the province of education and social laws to enlighten this moral sense, so that it shall be able to say what is right and wrong in particular cases; but the sense itself is one of the attributes of human nature. It is for this reason that "murder will out," that an inward monitor prompts the wrong-doer to get rid of the torment that haunts him, and seek peace and pardon by confession. There is no trace of such feeling in the brute creation.

3. Are we not also justified in saying that the tendency of Agnosticism is to undermine the worth of human affections? I do not mean indirectly, by losing sight of immortality, but still more by severing the affections from their source. If that fine and wide-spreading network, hidden from all human eyes —the winding, crossing, blending, diverging threads of human love—be indeed imagined as sprung everywhere out of everlasting night; as spun, snapt asunder, and again repaired by the mere automatic operation of unconscious material energy, without aim or purpose, then truly the deepest and purest affections of the

human heart lose all their worth, and no more deserve praise or blame than do the changes of the weather or the motions of the tides. If there be no eternal depository of our resolves and loves, our hopes and trusts; if they come, we know not whence, and go, we know not whither; and if we, who have felt them with such intensity, shall ourselves soon pass away into the general impersonal life of nature, as the withered leaves fall back into the soil out of which they came; if there is no treasure-house beyond the shifting sands of time where our treasures are garnered up, and we shall find them yet again; then what a petty, miserable, despicable thing is human life! And what an imposture, too! mocking us with longings which cannot be satisfied, with affections which have no object (for that is no true object which the accident of a moment may reduce to nothing), and with hopes which have no future!

4. Another effect of Agnosticism is to destroy in man the sense of moral responsibility towards his fellow-man. All that he is, on his theory, concerned with or interested in is the outward conduct of men. So long as that is irreproachable, he has nothing to do with the feelings and motives. These, from his point of view, can have no intrinsic value; they are neither good nor bad, except in so far as they issue

in conduct. On this view, a dumb paralytic, whose mind was bathed in an atmosphere of impure thoughts, and whose feelings were all selfish, would be as good in character as he who lived the life of a saint and hero: the virtue would be in the act, not in the agent. But that is to confound moral with intellectual worth. The worth of a poem or picture is solely in itself: the character of the poet or painter does not enhance or diminish the value, except in so far as it has influenced the work. But the test of character is the motive. The man is good or bad according to his motive. As poet or painter he may be admirable; as man, he may at the same time be execrable. That is a distinction which the Agnostic is logically bound to reject; since, on his principles, the only test of right and wrong is the bearing of human motives on the general welfare of society.

5. It seems to me, further, that some of our charitable institutions and benevolent customs would logically have no place in an Agnostic polity. One of the accepted doctrines of the Evolution philosophy is what is called "the survival of the fittest"—that is, of the organisms best adapted to their surroundings. The plants and animals which are least able to obey this law perish in the struggle for existence, having been supplanted by species better adapted to their

environment. Among men, too, the feebler races make way before the stronger; and the sickly and useless members of the community have commonly been allowed in pagan lands to die, when they have not been put to death. Hospitals for incurables are the creation of Christianity. There appears to be good evidence of hospitals in Buddhist countries even before the Christian era; but there is no evidence, I think, of hospitals for incurables as such; and hospitals for other sufferers were not open to strangers of another faith. The claim of suffering humanity, regardless of race and creed, was not practically recognized by any religion till God appeared in human form as "a Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief." So enlightened and noble a man as Plato recommended the destruction of deformed and sickly children, and the children of aged and diseased parents; all children, in fact, which were not likely to be useful to the State. The murder even of healthy infants was scarcely considered a moral offence among the most advanced races of the ancient world. It was, on the contrary, considered sometimes a rational and justifiable method of diminishing a superfluous population; and when it was condemned it was mainly, if not entirely, for political reasons.

And why should not infanticide be one of the

recognized laws of political economy if there is no future for the dying generations of mankind, no continuance beyond death of the life begun here? We must admire the unselfishness of those who, themselves unbelievers in a future life for man, nevertheless emulate the Christian philanthropist in caring for the helpless and useless members of society; but we must pronounce them illogical. For what good end can, on their principles, be served by prolonging the miserable life of a Lazarus even by the crumbs which fall from the rich man's table? Grant, however, that the life begun here is continued elsewhere, and then nothing that befalls it now can be insignificant; incurable sickness may contribute as much to its normal development as unbroken health. But if the whole of human life is bounded by the narrow horizon of this temporal scene, it seems not foolish only, but cruel, to prolong the wretchedness of a being whose life is useless to others and a burden to himself. If the Agnostic were logical, he would kill his incurably sick friend from the same kindness of heart which would prompt him to put a favourite dog or horse out of its misery as painlessly as might be.

6. Time will not allow of my appealing to another class of evidence which seems to point to a future life

for man as the necessary complement of this; such, for instance, as the extraordinary brilliancy sometimes displayed by the mind in a state of unsound or abnormal conditions of the bodily organs. The phenomenon of some nervous disorders are startling revelations of what the spiritual part of man, disengaged from matter, or under other material conditions, is capable. And the approach of death also—that is, the culmination of disease—has occasionally given wonderful depth, clearness, and insight to the spiritual powers. What a painful enigma, too, if death ends all, are many of the incidents of human life, such as the sudden quenching of a great life in the noon of a career of rare benefit to mankind? Why are the useful so often taken and the useless left? There may be good reasons, though we may not be able to see them, if this short life is but the vestibule of a life which is eternal; but if there be for man no future beyond the grave, the riddle remains insoluble.

In fine, may we not say, looking out on the broad facts of the world around us, that Agnosticism is not a good working theory—unlike the unproved hypothesis of a luminiferous ether which explains, as nothing else will, the known phenomena of light. The facts of the visible universe, though they may

not prove, yet surely imply, an unseen order of things working behind the veil of the things that are seen. May we not say with Bacon, in an essay already quoted, "I had rather believe all the fables in the Legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this universal frame is without a mind."

I do not say that Christianity solves all the riddles of this life; it does not profess to do so. What it does profess is to give a more rational explanation of them than any other that has hitherto been given —an explanation that brings them under the providential government of a universal Intelligence and a beneficent Personal Will. Grant the existence of such a Will, and there is nothing unreasonable in the belief that all things are working together for good. Being eternal, He can afford to be patient. The life of man on this planet is but an insignificant fraction of terrestrial life, while the life of each individual man is but a small fraction even of that. Is it reasonable to expect that such short-lived creatures as ourselves should compass the designs of an Eternal and Omniscient Mind? Let us imitate the Divine patience, and it may be that hereafter, if not here, the mysteries which now perplex us, and which physical science fails to reveal, will be made plain "when the day breaks and the shadows flee away."

II.

I.—IMMORTALITY AND THE DOCTRINE OF EVOLUTION.

"*Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.*"—2 PET. iii. 13.

IN the verses preceding the text the Apostle describes the end of this world in terms which are in striking agreement with the conclusions of modern science; and then he declares emphatically, not as a speculation, or hope, or probability, but as a matter of absolute certainty, that Christians look for "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." They were not to be affected in the least by the dissolution of the physical universe; it would not touch the continuity of their existence; their lives would simply pass on into the new order of things. Just as the old world, which had lasted so long, would not be annihilated in the catastrophe in which it was to be melted with fervent heat, but would, on

the contrary, be renewed in more glorious form, so the personal life of man would not be destroyed with the disorganization of his body, but would emerge out of the universal ruin clothed with a spiritual body, and pass on with fresh powers into the new order of things that was to follow. And the Apostle says this without the smallest doubt or hesitation. He states it as one of the elementary facts of human destiny. He assumes the immortality of man as an unquestionable truth, an axiom to be reasoned from, not a problem for discussion.

Now, among the heathen, and to a certain extent among the Jews, belief in immortality was rather a matter of hope than a firm article of faith. They longed for it, hoped for it, believed in it, but with a faith which was ever haunted by doubts. Appearances were against it, yet men have in all ages and in all conditions of life clung with desperate tenacity to the belief that human life survives death. It is an instinct co-extensive with the race, and is inexplicable if it be not true. Beliefs and instincts which are limited, confined to particular places or persons, may be explained by local circumstances. But a belief which is rooted in the universal mind and heart of humanity must derive its vitality from nothing less than truth itself. And this is especially true of a

belief that has ever been tormented by doubt. Nothing but truth could have resisted so long the corrosive action of persistent questioning.

Now, what is the explanation of this contradiction in the mind of man — the contradiction, I mean, between his inextinguishable hope and belief in immortality and the doubt that has always haunted that belief? The explanation is to be found in the duality of man's nature; in the antagonism between his bodily senses and his spirit—the contradiction which we see in the fact of a moral and spiritual being put under material conditions. Man's spiritual consciousness asserts his immortality, while his bodily senses suggest its impossibility. Lodged thus in the conviction of the mind of man at large, the doctrine of immortality met with no serious resistance till it encountered modern science. Now physical science knows nothing of spirit. It deals exclusively with gases, and fluids, and solids; with the three dimensions of length, breadth, and thickness. In such a domain, and among such phenomena, physical science found no data for belief in immortality, no positive evidence of it: indeed, the evidence seemed to warrant the opposite conclusion. This bred and diffused a scepticism as to the old doctrine of immortality. But as physical science advanced,

it found itself encompassed on all sides by an atmosphere of mystery. It could not get to the bottom of anything. It could not penetrate to the root of things. It found its progress barred by a wall which it could not pass. Man himself—what could it tell about him? It could explain the constituent elements of his body, but it could throw no light on the origin of his life, or on the origin of life at all in any one of its infinite forms. Life was a mystery which physical science could not, and probably never can, solve; not even the life of a blade of grass. The man of science takes up a blade of grass, and what can he tell you about it? He can tell you all about its material particles, its chemical constituents; but how it got its life he cannot tell. Nor can he explain even the mysterious process of the propagation of life; how a single microscopic seed can clothe a whole continent with verdure; how a single acorn can not only grow into an umbrageous oak, but can cover a whole continent with a forest of oaks.

And not only with regard to organic matter did physical science find itself surrounded with mystery: it found mystery pervading the whole universe of inorganic matter also. It discovered that behind all matter there was some force which it could not fathom. It talked of "laws of nature," but on further

investigation it saw that the "laws of nature" were nothing but man's way of tabulating operations which he could not explain. It could tell of gravitation; but what is gravitation? It describes, but does not explain, the mutual relations of the heavenly bodies and the atoms which compose them. Gravitation does not tell us the secret of the juxtaposition of the heavenly bodies, how they came into those relative positions by means of which the equilibrium of the universe is maintained. Nor does gravitation tell us anything about the beginning of motion. Thus physical science was constrained to acknowledge the extremely limited range of its vision, even in the region of inorganic matter. But with regard to man there were questions of another kind which pressed for an answer. Why am I here? How came I? Whence came I? Whither am I going? To these questions physical science could give no reply. It was obliged to appeal to other sciences—the science of biology, of psychology, of metaphysics, of theology; in fact, it found that there was no specific science which could afford to stand in isolation; that all the sciences were correlated; that they all needed each other; that each was obliged to seek light from some other in matters which were beyond its own ken.

And as physical science has thus extended its

knowledge, and has recognized the limits of its power and skill, it has become more patient, more modest, more humble. It began by casting doubt on the doctrine of immortality because it could find no evidence for it in the laboratory of nature, and it has ended by supplying a broad principle which undermines its own scepticism, namely, the principle of the reversal of first appearances. Physical science has taught us that in nature the reality is commonly opposed to what it seems to be. The firmament appears to be a solid vault. The sun appears to move round the earth, while the earth itself appears to be flat and at rest. Physical science has reversed all this. It has taught us that what seems a solid vault is in reality an expanse of infinite space; that the sun, though not indeed motionless, does not move round the earth; that the earth, instead of being flat and at rest, is a sphere moving with incredible swiftness round the sun. But the Copernican system which has taught us this was but the beginning of an endless process. It reversed, with regard to the physical universe, all our previous modes of thought. Matter appears solid and at rest. We know that it is neither solid nor at rest. We know that no two atoms in the universe ever touch each other. We know, moreover, that nothing in the universe is at

rest, that there is perpetual motion, that your body is never still in any of its parts, even when it seems to be most motionless; that your heart is pumping blood through your system with a power and energy which would suffice, in the course of twenty-four hours, to lift many tons of weight; that even solid masses, like rocks and bars of iron, are in continuous motion, not only moving through space with the earth of which they form a part, but moving also internally, the atoms of which they consist being in ceaseless motion though never touching. The energy of active agents seems to cease when they undergo disorganization; on the contrary, we know that energy does not cease, but merely changes its form. You have hit the target with a bullet, and the motion seems to be destroyed. It is not destroyed at all; it has merely changed to heat. And so throughout the universe. Therefore first appearances in nature are, as a rule, —I will not say false, but—illusive. And the reason—at least one reason—is that man is placed in this world for the purpose of education, for developing his nature. There is no royal road to learning. Man is obliged to acquire knowledge with infinite pains and trouble. If he could learn everything at once, without trouble and without pains, his knowledge would be immediate and without process. The result would be

the arrest of his development. His faculties, having no exercise, would not grow, and he would never pass, mentally or morally, beyond the stage of childhood. Therefore nature is always luring him on. She appears at first sight to be quite different from what she is found eventually to be, and man is thus obliged to follow and pierce the veil.

Now the tendency of the human mind is to rest in first appearances. And it is this premature confidence in first appearances that has bred scepticism with regard to immortality. Our inmost souls long for immortality. Our spiritual nature craves, cries aloud for it, and the highest minds have always believed in it. But we are such slaves of our bodily senses that even those of us, who are the most sincere believers in Christianity and in the immortality of the soul, can scarcely help now and then having some painful misgivings. In the awful presence of death we can hardly avoid asking ourselves, now and then, the question which tormented Job, "If a man die, shall he live again?" Death appears to be such a universal and resistless conqueror as to bar all hope of overcoming or escaping him. He has no respect for persons. Prince and peasant, old and young, sick and healthy, are alike powerless against him. Generation after generation passes away and makes no sign. Our loved ones

move out of sight and never return: we follow them with yearning desires and eager questionings; but there is no response. The form we have known so well is there, but it is motionless; the voice which we so often heard is still; the ear to which we so often spoke will hear no more; the hand which we so often grasped is cold and feels not; the eye is glazed and will never see again. And very soon all that remains of the living, moving, speaking being with whom we have been familiar, will be the prey of corruption and the worm. Death is an awful, a horrible spectre, and physical science at first helped to emphasize its terror. But now science has supplied an antidote by giving us what I have called the doctrine of the reversal of appearances. The Christian stands at the open grave, and says, "He is not here, he is risen." The man of science stands at the open grave too, and what message has he to deliver? If he is loyal to his creed, he will say, "My vocation is to wrest truth from illusive appearances. True, at first sight death seems to be a universal conqueror; there appears to be no power of resisting him; he seems able to overcome everything, and to destroy all forms of life. But just because first appearances look that way, my science bids me to distrust them. I do not find in nature any proof of continued life after death; I find, indeed,

what looks like the contrary. But for that very reason the Christian may be, is likely to be, right. In nature the truth is commonly the reverse of what it seems. As the landscape is inverted in the lens of the eye in order to get a true picture, so the seeming extinction of life in the grasp of death should create a wholesome doubt of death's final triumph." There was scientific truth as well as courageous faith in Tertullian's exclamation, "I believe because it is impossible" — impossible on man's first impressions; probable on his larger knowledge.

And now let me remind you of the warning of St. Peter in the verse immediately following the text: "Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of Him in peace, without spot, and blameless." This world, as the Apostle warns us, is not what it appears to be. It seems to be eternal, but is in fact hastening to its doom, when it shall be transformed into "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." Do you realize this? Do you feel, as a practical truth that influences your lives, that this world is not your home, that you are but pilgrims passing through it, and that all its importance for you, all its significance, depends entirely on its bearing on your eternal destiny? You are

immortal. The dissolution of the visible universe will not disturb the continuity of your existence. Your spirit will survive alike the decay of your body and the catastrophe towards which all earthly things are bound. What are you doing to prepare yourselves for the future and eternal life that awaits you? You did not come into this world by chance, you were not born by accident. You all came charged with a mission to use your best efforts to extend the frontier of your Master's kingdom by purifying your own hearts and leavening for good the hearts of all who come within the sphere of your influence. Your business here is not to enjoy yourselves in those fleeting pleasures which perish in the using; not to sip as many dainties as you can from the moments as they fly; not to gather as many flowers as you can pluck from the garden of this perishing earth; not even to rest in the enjoyment of those nobler delights which come from the exercise of the intellect in the investigation of the works of God and man; but rather to do your best to fit yourselves and others for the new heavens and new earth, which God has prepared for those who love Him.

III.

II.—IMMORTALITY AND THE DOCTRINE OF EVOLUTION.

"*Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.*"—2 PET. iii. 13.

LAST Sunday we considered the doctrine of man's immortality in connection with two great facts. In the first place, we saw that belief in it has been an instinct of man from the earliest time—an instinct which has always been co-extensive with the race; and students of physical science themselves tell us that instincts which are thus aboriginal and universal must have some corresponding reality. But we also saw that alongside of this universal belief in his own immortality man has hungered for clearer evidence—a fact which, so far from discrediting the belief, tended rather to confirm it, since only truth itself could have through so many centuries survived the corrosive action of persistent questioning. We saw, in addition,

that though at first sight the study of physical science seemed to negative the doctrine of immortality, science itself now supplies us with a principle which really furnishes an antidote to its own scepticism, namely, the principle of the reversal of appearances. In nature the first impression, as a rule, is a false impression. The sun appears to perform a daily revolution round the earth, and that is what man believed for many ages. Science has now taught us that the contrary is the fact, and that the earth performs a daily revolution on its own axis. And so it is through the whole realm of nature. First impressions generally require to be corrected by better knowledge, and therefore the very fact that students of physical science failed to find in the study of nature any data for belief in the immortality of man suggests a presumption that man is immortal, because the whole analogy of nature leads us to believe that the contrary of what seems is nearest the truth. Now let us pursue this line of argument to-day a little further. Look at the origin of the visible universe as it is now revealed to us by what is called the doctrine of evolution, a doctrine which, in its main lines at least, every thinking man now accepts. That doctrine teaches us that all the worlds which we see scattered through infinite space were originally

one sweltering mass of incandescent gases, in which no kind of life with which science is cognizant could have existed for a single moment. Out of that state of things life appeared on this planet, and probably on other planets also. But let us confine our attention to the planet with which we are best acquainted. It was at one time a swirling fire-mist, in which no kind of life known to us could have existed. And then, as it began to cool and form a crust at the outside, we find evidence of life of various kinds. Whence came it? Science recognizes the fact; it cannot help doing so, for the fact is incontrovertible. But whence came life, and how, is a mystery which still remains, and is likely to remain, insoluble by physical science. Moreover, the doctrine of evolution tells us that life appeared at first in its simplest form, a mere germ, and then gradually multiplied and ramified into all the countless varieties and species which now fill the earth. At last man appeared upon the scene as the crown and glory of the whole process of evolution. Now the point which I wish you to mark to-day is this, that if you were to plant yourselves in imagination at the commencement of all things, each successive stage of that evolutionary process would have beforehand appeared absolutely incredible and impossible. The first appearance of life at all on this

planet or anywhere is a vastly more wonderful thing, is really much more incredible, had we not known it to be a fact, than a resurrection from the dead. The origin of life is much more miraculous and supernatural than the survival of life after death. Had man been able to take his stand at some point of observation outside, where he could behold all that was going on, every fresh step in the development would have seemed to him simply incredible if he were told of it before it happened. And if any one had then predicted that out of that mass of fiery vapour would in course of time emerge the world of order and beauty with which we are familiar, nobody would have believed him.

Now consider what is meant by saying that all the different forms of life with which we are acquainted come originally from a single germ. Think of a tadpole swimming in the water, and say if you could have conceived it possible that it would have developed into an antlered deer, roaming through the forest. Would you have thought it credible, would any amount of antecedent reasoning have convinced you, that a headless mollusc could have developed in course of time the brain of a Shakespeare or a Newton? Yet that is the kind of marvels which the professors of physical science ask us to believe. The doctrine of

evolution, moreover, tells us that the propagation of life was at first sexless, and then became bi-sexual. You remember Hume's destructive formula against miracles, namely, "that it is more credible that testimony should be false than that miracles should be true." Now that formula would have discredited beforehand every stage of the evolutionary process, for every fresh stage was a miracle on the previous state of things. It was an innovation which to the mind of man would have appeared absolutely inconceivable, incredible, and impossible. Between these stages of evolution were gulfs which contemporary reason would have pronounced impassable, and across which imagination could not have leapt. We know that these gulfs, which, prior to experience, would have seemed impossible to bridge, have, as a matter of fact, been passed. Looking back, we have now no difficulty in accepting facts in endless series which would have appeared incredible before the event.

With such a history of marvels and miracles behind us, what right have we to assume that the record of the marvellous is closed? What right have we to assume that, because we ourselves have never experienced or seen the survival of man after death, the thing is impossible? Consider the vast multitude of apparently impossible things that science has now revealed

to us. Men of science are too much given to call that impossible of which they find no evidence in the material universe. But the truth is that nothing is impossible which does not contradict a necessary law of thought. It is absolutely impossible that two straight lines running parallel can ever enclose a space; the mind cannot conceive the possibility of such a thing; it contradicts a fundamental law of thought; therefore we cannot accept it as a possibility. But in that sense there is nothing incredible in the doctrine of man's immortality. It contradicts no fundamental law of the intellect, or any axiom of science. Miracles have sometimes been spoken of as interruptions or violations of the laws of nature. They are nothing of the kind. A miracle is either the introduction of a law of which the mind had no previous experience, or the manipulation of the laws of nature as we know them. When you fling a stone into the air you do not violate the law of gravitation; you merely counteract its action for the time being by the law of human vitality and muscular force; the law of gravitation goes on all the while in its undisturbed majesty and might. Turning water into wine is no violation of any law of nature; it is merely the acceleration of a natural process artificially developed. Similarly, we may say that there is no reason

whatever either in the fundamental facts of man's consciousness, or in the principles of science, to lead us to disbelieve in a survival of man after the dissolution of his body.

Then, again, men of science sometimes tell us that a miracle is impossible, because it implies a breach of the continuity of the ordinary laws of nature. But evolution shows us that there have been numberless breaches in that law of continuity. The law of continuity was broken when life first appeared on our planet, and again when its propagation changed from a sexless to a bi-sexual process. Every stage in the course of evolution was a breach of the law of continuity existing previously. Why, then, should we draw a hard-and-fast line, and assume arbitrarily that there can be no other breach in the future? Why should we assume, when we know that there have been in the past so many breaches of continuity—which beforehand would have seemed impossible—that man cannot survive that great mystery which is enshrouded by death? For not only does the past history of this world supply arguments in favour of the probability of man's survival after death, but the analogies of nature around us furnish us with numerous arguments to the same effect. Take into your hands a tiny acorn, and if you had no previous experience of what

it was, could you have believed, would anything have persuaded you, that within the compass of that small acorn was enclosed not only a spreading oak, but a whole forest of oaks? Take up an egg, and could you believe, without experience, that within the shell of that egg a flying bird was enclosed? Prior to experience, the egg appears as dead and lifeless as a human corpse; yet out of that seemingly dead matter will grow a soaring eagle. The shell remains, a mere piece of lifeless matter, but the life it contained has not ceased to be; it has only passed into another and a higher form of being. With such analogies in the ordinary operations of nature, why should it be thought incredible that death is merely a development of a lower form of human life into a higher. If an egg can, by dying, emerge in an eagle, or a caterpillar in a butterfly, why should not a dying man rise into immortal life? Look at the caterpillar, as it crawls slowly along the ground, almost blind. Could you have believed, without experience, that within that crawling caterpillar was a gorgeous butterfly, capable of flitting about in the sunshine, as it sips nectar from flower to flower? I say, then, that all these facts, with which our own experience and the history of physical science have now made us familiar, would, prior to experience, have appeared to every one of us,

and even to men of science themselves, vastly more mysterious and miraculous, and infinitely more impossible to the human imagination and reason, than the resurrection of man from the dead, or the survival of the soul of man after the dissolution of his body.

But an objector might say that the analogies I have given are not complete, that what happens in the caterpillar and in the acorn and in the egg is not a destruction of the previous form, but only a transformation. Well, and why should we assume that what happens in the case of man's immortality is destruction, and not transformation? As a matter of fact, there is, in the examples which I have given, literal destruction of the tissues of the old form. You can see the shrivelled body of the caterpillar after it has passed through its chrysalis state into the form of a butterfly. You can pluck up the rotten acorn out of the ground out of which the new tree has emerged, and you see that the dissolution of its material particles is as literally true as the dissolution of the human body in death. There is a complete analogy so far. The material particles of the old form of the caterpillar and the acorn and the egg are disintegrated as truly as the material particles of the human body. But then the objector might say further that

man's soul, his consciousness, his ego, his self, is connected with the particular part of the body which we call the brain; that man can survive the dissolution and the destruction of large parts of his body, but cannot survive the dissolution of his brain; and that therefore man's self, his personal consciousness, is a mere function of the brain. But what brain? Man, in the course of years, has not one brain only, he has many brains; he has not one body only, he has many bodies. Your body is never at rest, it is in perpetual motion, and every movement of its particles implies the destruction of its tissues. The tissues of the body are thus in constant process of destruction, and the loss is made good by the food you take, just as the fire on your hearth is kept alive by the coal you heap upon it. The vital fire and energy of your body would be quenched if this ceaseless decay were not made good by a regular supply of food. Now the brain, like the rest of the body, is being destroyed from moment to moment. It used to be the doctrine of physiologists that the whole body of man changed completely in seven years; it is now an accepted fact that it changes absolutely within the year; some physiologists say even within one month. Certainly, therefore, every part of your body and every particle of your brain have passed away in the course of a

year. Consequently, when the materialist tells us that man's consciousness is a mere function of the brain, I ask him which brain? A man of twenty years of age has had twenty brains; of which of them is the soul a mere function? But materialists also tell us that the intellectual and moral faculties are connected with certain parts of the brain. They argue, therefore, that, since injury to a certain section of the brain involves injury to the corresponding mental faculty, it follows that human consciousness is not one and indivisible—thereby implying a personality apart from matter—but is, on the contrary, a physical sensation distributed among the different parts of the brain. Go on, therefore, says the materialist, cutting away the brain, slice by slice, and you slice away piecemeal at the same time mental faculty after mental faculty, until you leave nothing at all. The destruction of the brain therefore means, they argue, destruction of man himself; there is nothing left.

But I say, in answer to this, that the brain is being sliced away constantly, that with every movement of the particles within the brain there is destruction of the tissues of the brain going on; and yet we are conscious that the man himself is not destroyed. Indeed, Nature herself supplies illustrations of this piecemeal destruction of the body without any

concomitant destruction of the vital organism. There are certain animals which shed some of their limbs periodically, and others which shed the whole exterior of their bodies; and in the interval of transition between the shedding of the old body and the acquisition of the new, the animal is impotent; it is practically as dead as a corpse, and can do nothing to feed or defend itself; and yet it has, all the while, some spiritual essence which mysteriously gathers round it a new body. We have some analogy here to what we may believe happens in the case of man when he dies. St. Paul speaks of man being clothed with a spiritual body instead of the material body which he now bears about with him. Why, then, should not our souls, as in the case of the animals of which I have spoken, gather round them some material clothing adapted to their new condition, similar to what we see in nature around us?

Then consider what memory means. If the soul were a mere function of the brain, there could be no such thing as memory. If the consciousness, the ego, man's personal self, be a mere function of the brain, how comes it that we remember past events? If the memory be a mere impression, or a series of impressions, registered on the tablets of the brain, then those impressions could no more survive the dissolution of the

brain than writing on wax could survive the melting of the wax. But we know, our consciousness assures us of the fact, that we are now the same individuals that we were years ago. We remember what we said, and did, and wrote, and thought, when we had other bodies. How could that be if the soul were a mere function of the brain? Why, in that case the soul would perish with the destruction of the original brain, and we could remember nothing that happened during the life we then lived. We may conclude then that our memory, our consciousness of personal identity with our past, is a proof that the mind is no mere function of the brain, but is, on the contrary, independent of it, though it uses it as an organ of communication with the material world. Science, therefore, no more obliges us to believe that man perishes with his mortal body than it obliges us to believe that a singer loses his knowledge of music when he has lost his voice, or a mathematician his faculty of reasoning when hand and tongue are paralyzed. What happens in such cases is not that the man has lost any part of his mental equipment, but that his organ of expression has failed him, like a musical instrument which is out of tune or broken. In like manner, with the destruction of his material body man loses the power of communicating with the material creation around him.

Then, again, you test matter by mind. But if matter is itself inclusive of mind, and mind is only a function of matter, you could not possibly test and measure matter by mind, for there would be no such thing as mind; it would simply be matter investigating matter. Consider, further, that the thing made is separate from the process of making it. You make a watch of certain materials for a given purpose; but the watch itself is quite separate from the process of its manufacture. The whole end of that process is to make an instrument that shall register time, and the thing made is thus separable and separate from the process of making. Now men of science tell us that man is the paragon and crown of nature, that he is the highest effort of the evolutionary process. To suppose, then, that this crown and paragon of nature is himself a part of that process, as he would be if he were to perish with his body, is an absurdity, is against all reason. It would be like supposing that a watch was made for the purpose of being shivered in pieces the day after it was made. Consider how short man's life is in comparison not only with the infinite ages of the process of which he is the crown, but in comparison with the ages of some animals in this world. Man enjoys the fulness of his faculties only for a very short period. He

takes a certain time to develop to maturity, and has hardly ceased to grow when he begins to decay. But if man is the crown of creation — the end towards which all this wonderful process has been going on for untold ages—is he to be engulphed in the process which made him? That were a conclusion which contradicts all the instincts and dictates of man's own reason.

Go back again in your mind to the origin of all things. Physical science begins with matter in a homogeneous state of diffusion, at rest either eternally or as the result of exhausted force. Now matter at rest, as far as science knows, must remain at rest. Matter in a state of inertia must ever remain in that state unless some force external to and independent of matter comes to set it in motion. What was that force? It was evidently a force which had mind, which had thought and intelligence. The old belief was that the visible universe is a kind of machine, made suddenly and launched into space under the guidance and control of certain laws, and set, like a watch, to go for a given time known only to its Maker. Modern science has corrected this error. We now know that this earth, as we behold it, is the outcome of countless ages of development from lower forms to higher, ending in man, the last of the series as

far as science can throw any light upon the subject. Now, whatever you may think about the origin of things, whatever view you take of that mysterious Force from which the universe came and by which it is sustained—whether you believe it to be personal and conscious, or impersonal and working unconsciously towards a crowning result — it is surely unreasonable to suppose that the whole process, those vast cycles of slow but steady progress, should issue in a being able to understand the world in which he lives and to rule it as a kind of god, and yet be himself one of the most perishable and short-lived of created things. Impossible! Reason rebels against a conclusion which would make of nature not merely "a mighty maze without a plan," but a system of self-contradiction and absurdity. What we see in nature is manifold aspiration towards ends which, unaided, she cannot reach; unconscious prophecies of ideals which she cannot herself realize; potentialities which need some power beyond her own to bring them forth. Man supplies this power. There is scarcely one of the products of nature that does not hold in germ an ideal which requires human skill to realize it. Plants and animals have capacities for higher, more beautiful lives than they can reach without man's help. Even in the realm of inorganic

matter we find latent possibilities which man alone is able to develop: music in inexhaustible profusion in the silent air; light, and heat, and motive power in that magnetic force which man has in our own times made subservient to his will. Man is thus found to be correlated to the unknown as well as to the known. His spirit transcends the visible, and by dream, by vision, by unquenchable hope, by the unceasing cry of the creature for the Creator, by aspiration after a perfection which is unattainable here, by the presence of evil, and the burden of sorrow, and the unappeasable hunger of love, the spirit of man penetrates the veil which conceals the spiritual world, and feels with an instinct which no sophistry can destroy, that there must be a meaning, a purpose, and an end behind the mystery which now surrounds and baffles him.

IV.

III.—IMMORTALITY AND THE DOCTRINE OF EVOLUTION.

"*Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.*"—2 PET. iii. 13.

ALL through my argument I have assumed that the scientific doctrine of evolution is true within certain limits and up to a certain point, as opposed to the old mechanical theory of creation, which represented God as having made the visible universe in a given time, and in complete form, by the special creation of an infinite variety of species in the vegetable and animal worlds. The Christian need have no hesitation in accepting, within reasonable bounds, the doctrine of evolution, namely, that all forms of life have been developed from a few primordial germs, in an ascending scale, till man appeared as the apex and, in a manner, the recapitulation of the process. Physical

science agrees with the Bible in pronouncing man to be the last product, the final form in the process—whatever that process be—of creation. I do not say that the doctrine of evolution, even to the extent in which I have assumed its truth, is an absolutely proved fact. It is not; but the balance of evidence is so much that way that we had better look the doctrine frankly in the face and ask ourselves whether there is anything in it calculated to shake our faith in the creed of Christendom. So far as I have stated it, there is nothing in the doctrine of evolution that conflicts with the Christian faith. It deals only, and can only deal, with man's body, which the Bible tells us was formed out of the ground; whether by an act of special and immediate creation, or by a long process of development, the Bible does not say, nor is it a matter of the least consequence. But the Bible does
" make a difference in kind, and not merely in degree, between the genesis of man and all other creatures on this planet, when it tells us that having fashioned man's material and animal part out of the dust of the ground, the Creator "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Of that living soul physical science knows nothing; it must confine its researches to the material and animal part of man. Beyond that boundary the doctrine of

evolution cannot move a step, for it has no data to guide it. It stops at man's intellectual and moral faculties. This is admitted by Wallace, who takes rank with Darwin himself as an authority on evolution, both in point of time and of eminence.

We may therefore, within the limits which I have indicated, accept the doctrine of evolution without any fear of its being injurious to our faith as Christians. So far from driving God out of the world, or removing Him to a distance from us, it really brings Him closer, much closer to us than the old theory of creation, and helps us to realize the Apostle's declaration that "in Him we live, and move, and have our being." This it does in two ways—first, by showing the need of a Supreme Intelligence pervading the universe, to control and guide the infinitely various directions and definite limits of the evolutionary process. No rational doctrine of chances can account for the orderly development of life, in all its forms, from a few primordial germs, or explain order out of chaos. Our reason demands the presence of a presiding mind at every fresh stage of the process.

In the second place, the doctrine of evolution represents the creation as, in a manner, the image of the Creator. On the old theory we could see that the world reflected the power of the Creator, His skill,

His majesty, His glory, His love of what is beautiful. The doctrine of evolution teaches all that; but it teaches, in addition, a grand truth which the mechanical view of creation tended to obscure—the truth of God's unity in plurality. It shows us that not only are all the worlds which are scattered through infinite space correlated, governed by identical laws, acting and re-acting on each other, necessary to each other, but that the atoms which compose these vast masses are also correlated, and attract each other at opposite points of their respective globes. Surely this is a much nobler view of creation and of its relation to its Maker than the view which pictured God as the author of a series of worlds, created and existing independently of each other, and without any genetic relation between their component parts. Is it not much easier to believe that the whole creation came from one supreme mind, when you see that it is the product of one process, and has been wrought through all its varieties on one principle — the principle of development? That method was always recognized within the confines of separate departments. Men always saw the growth of great results from small beginnings; a bountiful harvest from a few grains of seed; a forest from an acorn; a herd of cattle from a single pair;

a race of men from two parents. But this law of plurality in unity becomes much more manifest and majestic when we know that it governs the whole universe, not merely in the relations of the heavenly bodies to each other, but in the interdependence of their minutest atoms. That out of a speck of protoplasm, out of a rudimentary cell of inchoate life, God should have developed, through an infinite series of gradually ascending forms of life, the material organ of the intellect of a Shakespeare, is to my mind much more wonderful, and gives me a much more exalted idea of the Creator than I should have by believing that the brain of Shakespeare was a special creation; which, by the way, no intelligent person does believe. For we are all evolutionists up to a certain point. We all believe that Shakespeare's brain was at least evolved somehow from Adam's. And what we observe in the genesis of life at large holds good also in the life of man as an individual, as a member of society and as citizen of a state. Not only does his body grow from a microscopic cell, but his moral and mental faculties follow the same method. So does his acquisition of knowledge. Social institutions and political systems are further illustrations of the method of evolution. Even the Christian Church obeys this law of

development. Its Divine Founder, foreseeing and ordering the law of its growth, compared it to the growth of a tree from a tiny seed. If God had worked by different plans in the world of inorganic matter, in the realm of life, in the social system, in political institutions, the unity of creation would have been broken, and Polytheism would have been a plausible creed. But when we behold man as the apex of creation, the end of an ascending scale of evolution through infinite gradations from a rudimentary germ, reason itself forces the conviction that the visible universe came from one designing mind, which saw the end from the beginning, and ordained the process.

Nor need it distress us to find in the brute world some foregleams, unconscious prophecies, of man's intellectual and moral faculties. Animals can reason within varying limits; they can love; they have a kind of memory; some of them can feel a wrong and can resent it; they are capable of shame, and perhaps a few of them have some faint sense of humour. But no species of animal has ever shown any originating power or any capacity for spontaneous progress. The resemblance which in various ways they bear to man never passes beyond well-defined limits. It points to possibilities which mere animal life can never reach, and shows that the brute is not the final

form in creation; that the evolution of life has not yet reached its goal. These forecasts, these fragmentary shadows heralding the advent of a creature higher in the scale of being, point to a further development on the plane of the natural life.

But the doctrine of evolution does not oblige us to believe that there is no end to the process. On the contrary, it tends to show that the process aims at a final achievement towards which all its ways converge. If we observe a tendency to develop we also find a tendency towards permanence of type. Neither geology nor history supplies any record of the change of one species into another. Alike in the vegetable and animal kingdom we find what looks like an obstinate resistance to the transmutation of clearly distinct species. So far as palæontology has thrown any light on the subject of evolution, the evidence goes to show permanence of type combined with intermittent introduction of new forms, as distinguished from descent with gradual modification. Superficial resemblance is no evidence of ancestral relationship. In appearance the ape comes nearest man; but some other animals far surpass it in intelligence and in those qualities which may be regarded as a foreshadowing of a moral sense. In answer to the objection that geology offers no evidence of any

one species having gradually or suddenly passed into another, evolutionists are wont to appeal to the slowness of the process and the vast æons of time required to embrace it. But the age of the earth since it became habitable by any form of organic life known to us can be approximately calculated, and it falls far short of the demands made upon it by the extreme evolutionists.

The attempt to account for the intellectual and moral qualities of man by evolution is not supported by anything which can properly be called evidence. But however that may be, the history of the earth and of man seems to prove that the evolutionary process has stopped with the human species. Man appears as an epitome of previous developments: he seems to sum up in himself the critical stages of the process, and to close the series; to repeat in embryo the story of creation from its first chapter to its last. Human skill and ingenuity can raise both vegetable and animal species above their natural level; can create an imitation of new species. But it is only an imitation, for when man withdraws his fostering and controlling hand the plant or animal begins to go back by rapid stages to its original type. And as the species mounts higher in the scale, the tendency to permanence

becomes stronger. In short, the whole process points to man as its end. It begins with a law of mechanical necessity. There is an entire, or almost an entire, absence of freedom. The tree, the plant, all vegetable life, is rooted to one spot, is anchored to the ground, and cannot move beyond the length of its tether. It is free to develop its life within those narrow bounds, but cannot pass beyond them. Its liberty is strictly confined to the task of procuring nourishment from the small area of earth and air in which it is planted. When you pass from vegetable to animal life you observe some advance in the direction of freedom. The worm crawls slowly, but it can move from place to place. It is not rooted to one spot. It has more of spontaneity than a tree, more sensation, more power to guard its life. And so the progress goes on through a series of stages—more freedom, more intelligence, more capacity for civilization, till at last man appears. And then you find that the tendency towards evolution to a higher species stops, and a fresh set of laws come in which change, and in some respects reverse, the laws of evolution. The two great laws of evolution are the law of natural selection and variation, and the law of what is called the struggle for existence. The aim of these laws is plainly the production of species. When

that end is attained, the laws which produced it appear to have fulfilled their purpose. In the higher species they cease to act altogether, and they show an increasing tendency to do so as the species mount higher in the process of evolution.

From this we may infer that an end of physical variation will be reached—in other words, that the laws of evolution are the ministers of a designing mind which is working towards a species with which physical evolution shall cease and the development shall take another direction. The apparition of man upon the scene closes the old process and begins a new one. Personality now supersedes instinct. Till then we have rudimentary indications, in varying degrees of development, of human personality—indications of reasoning power, human feelings, will; but they are indications only; pointing to a possibility which the animal cannot realize. The animal world, through all its species, is "held with bit and bridle;"[1] it is under the control of an external force which regulates its movements within a narrow area of prescribed limits.

Man appears under a new system of laws. Physically he starts the inferior of the brutes, feebler, more helpless, more stupid than they; but he has

[1] Ps. xxxii. 8-9.

that within him which enables him soon to outstrip them in the race and make them subservient to his will. He is free, and he knows it. His body may be coerced, but he is conscious that no external force can bend his will without his consent The "bit and bridle" that control "horse and mule, which have no understanding," give place in man to persuasion, to an appeal to his reason, and feeling, and conscience. The Divine law for him is, "I will guide thee with mine eye." Good and evil are placed before him, with all he needs for making a right choice; but the final decision rests with himself. Development by the application of external force gives place to development by conscious self-determined effort from within. Man has become a law unto himself. The law of natural selection, which is a kind of blind choice in plants and animals, gives way to man's intelligent free choice. The law of progression by the struggle for existence gradually recedes before the law of self-sacrificing love. It is not with the strong, the ruthless, the cruel, that the final victory remains, but with the gentle and long-suffering. "Thy gentleness hath made me great," says the Psalmist; not Thy power, or wisdom, or majesty. Love, after all, is the universal conqueror, and its method is gentleness. In the degree in which man becomes civilized,

and much more as he imbibes the spirit of Christianity, the struggle for existence—"the good old rule, the simple plan, that he should take who has the power, and he should keep who can,"—succumbs to the law of the Cross; he loses his life in order to find it. The desire to live by the sacrifice of others becomes absorbed in pity for the weak and suffering, and in self-sacrificing efforts to save instead of destroying them. In the natural life what one takes another loses; by how much the plant, or animal, or man gains, by so much some other creature loses. A contrary law prevails in the spiritual life. There the law is that "it is more blessed to give than to receive." Give your own food or clothing to the needy, and you are physically so much the poorer. Impart a spiritual gift, and your own store is thereby increased. The more you give away of your own knowledge of music, or language, or any other intellectual possession, the more you enrich yourself. The case is the same with your moral qualities. Your love is enlarged in proportion as you bestow it on others. The new law that was to take the place of the struggle for existence was proclaimed by our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount, when He declared that "the meek shall inherit the earth." The proclamation of that law must have sounded marvellous at that time—the

baseless dream of an unreasoning enthusiasm. For force was then the dominant law, not only in the world of plants and animals, but of men as well. The struggle for existence, which is but another name for the law of selfishness, prevailed everywhere. Christianity, which restores its ideal to humanity—now the disfigured image of its Maker—substitutes the law of self-sacrifice for that of self-seeking. It reveals God as a Father whose love is "over all His works"—not over man only, but also over the much cattle of Nineveh,[1] over the young ravens that call upon Him, over the sparrow that falls not to the ground without His provident care, and over the lilies of the field, which toil not nor spin, yet are arrayed in glory more than Solomon's. And the more man becomes imbued with the Spirit of Christ, the Ideal Man, the more does he find himself in sympathy with all forms of life.

Man thus appears as the ideal towards which the process of evolution has been working from the dawn of life upon our planet to its fulness in him. He is the first being in the process whom we can contemplate as potentially perfect, as containing within himself the possibility of perfection. We can set no limits to his latent powers. But these powers are not on the plane

[1] Jonah iv. 11.

of physical evolution. That process ends in him, and is superseded by a process of spiritual development. It is not to a more perfect development of his physical nature that man aspires; not to swifter feet or keener eyes, or wings wherewith to float in space and cleave the air, but to such a development of his spiritual nature as shall enable him to bend the laws of the physical creation to his purposes and make them his obedient slaves. The eagle surpasses him in vision, and most animals surpass him in rapidity of motion; but he easily excels them all by the exercise of his mental faculties, which enable him to travel faster than the swiftest bird, to see farther than the eagle, and to communicate with his fellow-man on the other side of the globe in a moment of time. Instead of aiming at any enlargement of his bodily vision, he makes a microscope wherewith he sees into the infinitely little and constructs a telescope which enables him to scan infinite space.

Now, in every antecedent order of life there have been sympathetic forecasts of the higher development in store for the species within the sphere of its natural environment. The bird in embryo has a foretaste of its higher life, premonitory symptoms of the new life that awaits it. Before it is fledged it flutters its rudimentary pinions in anticipation of its future flight

in the air. In animals we observe these reachings forward to a higher development of their physical organs. But in man there is no foregleam of any further evolution in a physical direction. Foregleams indeed there are in abundance, but they all tend spiritward. The reptile becomes a mammal, and shows indications of the change towards which it tends. The mammal becomes a man, and shows no sign of any higher development. For man shows no symptom of any higher form of physical life. He is the terminus of the process. The promise to him is that he shall be as the angels, and it is in that direction that his aspirations tend. The brute inheritance is being gradually cast off, and he moves forward towards the Divine life. His "earthly tabernacle," to use the Scriptural phrase, is in course of gradual dissolution, and his spiritual nature, if he gives it fair play, is maturing for the "new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." But the chasm, I may be told, which divides the mortal from the immortal is immeasurable. Yes, to our limited vision. So was the chasm which divided the aboriginal life-germ from the brain of a Shakespeare or Newton till science enlightened us. And if I am asked at what point the principle of immortality comes into mortal life, I ask the objector to explain where the principle of

self-perpetuation comes into every organic growth. If he says that it was always there potentially, I tell him that he is making an assumption for which, however probable, he has no evidence. I have as good evidence for asserting that immortality is ideally one of the original endowments of humanity. Man's whole nature reaches forward towards immortality; if not as an inherent attribute of humanity, at least as a supernatural gift obtainable by obedience to the will of God.

Seeing, then, that man is the final purpose of the process of evolution, is it not irrational in the extreme to suppose that the being who appears as the aim and end of the whole process, the being for whose advent this prolonged preparation has been made, will perish almost as soon as he is born? that his short span of life on earth is the whole of him? that his far-reaching aspirations—in contradiction to the entire history of evolution up to him—are doomed to be frustrated? No; the doctrine of evolution, with man as its final outcome, points to man's immortality—to the survival of his real self after the dissolution of his material organism. That, of course, presupposes a spiritual world as man's abode, an environment adapted to the transformation of the material man into the spiritual. Is there any proof of such a

spiritual world? That depends on the kind of proof demanded. There is no demonstrative proof; but there is an aggregate of probabilities so strong as to constitute sufficient evidence. Probability may, in some cases, amount to certainty. All men of science now believe in the existence of a luminiferous ether pervading all space. But of this ether there is no other proof than that the accepted theory of light —what is called the undulatory theory—requires the ether as a medium for the transmission of light. There is hardly any other proof whatever. Men of science assure us that whatever is needed to account for any well-attested fact may be accepted as true; and because the undulatory theory of light, which is now an established truth of science, can only be accounted for by the existence of a luminiferous ether, this ether is believed, by a process of induction, to exist. Vision is caused by the impact of countless waves of luminiferous ether on the retina of the eye, as hearing is caused by the impact of countless waves of agitated air on the tympanum of the ear. But of these ether waves there is no mathematical proof—only assumption based on probabilities so strong as to amount to proof.

Another illustration of this method of reasoning is supplied by the circumstances which led to the

discovery of the planet Neptune. It was discovered simultaneously by an English and by a French astronomer, working independently of each other. What was the basis of their calculation? The fact that they found a disturbance, mysterious movements, in a certain part of the firmament, which could only be accounted for by the existence in that place of some hitherto undiscovered heavenly body. So they went on for weeks and months trying to fix the exact place where the invisible star ought to be; and having reached their conclusion by abstruse calculations, they indicated the spot to which some powerful telescope should be pointed. And sure enough, when the telescope was pointed to that spot, the planet Neptune was seen. We have something analogous to this in the constitution of the human mind. There are certain disturbances in the mind of man which cannot be accounted for otherwise than by the existence of a spiritual world and a Supreme Being, who rules and regulates it. Take the doctrine of prayer as an instance. How can you account for men, in moments of peril or sorrow, lifting up appealing eyes and imploring hands and fervent prayers to an invisible Being whom they believe able and willing to answer prayer, unless there is a reality corresponding to the

disturbance? Neptune was discovered because its invisible presence caused a disturbance in its neighbourhood, which could not otherwise be accounted for. And if it had never been discovered, if no instrument had existed powerful enough to detect its presence, or there were no midnight watchers to scan the heavens in search of it, that would not prove that the planet was not there. Similarly, the universal instinct of prayer demands the existence of a Being who hears prayer, whether men realize or fail to realize His presence. "Thou that hearest prayer, unto Thee shall all flesh come." That is the voice of reason not less than of devotion.

Nor is prayer the only instinct in human nature which points to immortality. Man's thought is infinite, but he is here bounded by the limitations of temporal conditions. He cannot come to the end of anything. His imagination has no bounds. He builds a palace and dwells in a cell. He knows that his love is eternal, but on earth it is perpetually frustrated. He feels that the creations of his intellect are immortal in the realm of spirit, yet he is himself subject to death. He has an instinct which tells him that those whom he has loved on earth survive death, and he places unfading flowers on their tombs to attest his belief that they still live,

and erects monuments to their memory. It is not so with the animals. They will fight for their young, even to death, so long as their offspring require their care. But after that, the offspring is nothing to their parents, and they see it die without a pang. But man puts out feelers on the right hand and on the left towards a spiritual world in which he believes at the roots of his being, in spite of all doubts and cavillings to the contrary.

There is, however, a sect, adorned by some men of great ability and virtue, who would persuade us that man, the individual, dies, but that the race endures. This they call "The Religion of Humanity." They do not believe in a personal God, or in the personal existence of man after death. In short, they deny altogether the existence of a spiritual world. They preach the mortality of man, but the immortality of humanity. This theory seems to me exposed to two fatal objections. First, to assume an abstraction called Humanity, and to spell it with a big "H," does not make it a real entity. You cannot love an abstraction, or be moved by it. Who would die for an abstract humanity? We interest ourselves in humanity as we know it in the voices and faces, the joys and sorrows, of its individual members. But nobody, in the long run, will make any sacrifice for

a pale abstraction. If men and women cease to exist in the moment of death, it is a matter of small moment what happens to the race. Still, this view had some nobility of sentiment about it so long as men believed in the stability of the visible universe—a belief prevalent even among scientific men till lately. If this world is eternal, there is no scientific reason why humanity should not continue to inhabit it eternally. But physical science has lately come round to the teaching of our Lord and of St. Peter, in the chapter from which the text is taken, namely, that there shall be a dissolution of the present order of things—a reversion to the original mass of fiery vapour out of which it emerged, ending in the complete disappearance of the present world, as the distinguished authors of the "Unseen Universe" suggest; or its reduction to the condition of a cold inert cinder; or its fresh start on a repetition of the process which has ended in this general cataclysm. In any case, there will be no place for mortal man. The whole race must perish as surely as its individual members now perish in the grasp of death. No kind of physical life can survive the tremendous collision of the heavenly bodies, towards which both astronomers and the Bible assure us that the world is tending, when "the elements shall melt with fervent heat." So

that even if it were possible to believe in an abstract humanity as a basis for conduct, it is impossible to believe in it as a basis for immortality. Humanity is doomed to death in the race as surely as in the individual; and if there is no life beyond the frontiers of death, man is in a worse condition than the animals that perish. If perdition awaits all, the brutes have the best of it, and Schopenhauer was right in saying that consciousness is the mistake and malady of nature. The animals are not conscious of their misery. Man is only too conscious of his; and if no future life awaits him, not only is religion a superstition, but philosophy is a gigantic fraud, and the doctrine of evolution leads to chaos.

There is much more to be said on the subject, but there is no time to say it now. Remember, meanwhile, that you cannot undo your prerogative of immortality; but you can ruin the life which you cannot end. And wherefore? "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" We are heirs of eternity, and the importance of this life for us lies in its bearing on our eternal destiny. We are but actors on the stage of this world, and to each God has given a part to play. There are kings and subjects, rich and poor,

sick and whole, merry and sad, masters and servants. And just as in a theatre the excellence of an actor depends on his manner of acting, not on the part he plays—how he acts, not what he acts—so it is with us in the part which the Lord of the universe has assigned to each of us. In the one case, as in the other, it is better to play the part of a beggar well than to play the part of a monarch ill. The part is nothing: the acting is everything. The curtain will soon fall, and we shall pass behind the scene; and then how insignificant will appear the fleeting joys for the sake of which we were tempted to barter our heavenly birthright; how insignificant also the sickness, or sorrow, or poverty, or humiliation, which seems so intolerable now.

V.

I.—THE MANY MANSIONS OF THE SPIRITUAL REALM.

"*In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.*"—JOHN xiv. 2.

IF "familiarity" does not always breed, as the proverb says, "contempt," it is certainly very apt to breed indifference. We see many instances of this in ordinary life. Men may live for years in the midst of beautiful scenery, yet be insensible to its charms because they see it every day. Or their home may be close to some historic scene, some spot consecrated by deeds of heroism, and made immortal by the magnitude of the issues which hung for a while trembling in the balance—a Plain of Marathon, a Bay of Salamis, a Field of Waterloo—yet never feel the spell which attracts strangers from afar, just because the scene is to them so familiar. Are we not exposed to the same kind of temptation from our familiarity with the

Bible? Our eyes and ears are so used to its language that its words sometimes pass through our minds without leaving any distinct impression, or perhaps an erroneous impression, not derived from the Bible at all, but from some tradition or current belief read into the Bible. Take the words of the text by way of illustration, and compare them with the popular idea of heaven as a vast place in which God is visibly present, with the host of angels and the spirits of the just made perfect worshipping before His throne, and into which all the redeemed will eventually be gathered. Our Lord tells us that, on the contrary, heaven is not one common abode for angels and sanctified human beings, but a realm of many dwelling-places, suited to a great variety of capacities and characters. And He adds that this is so much in accordance with right reason, so natural a view to take, that He would have made a special revelation of the fact if it were otherwise. "If it were not so I would have told you." The subject is a very interesting and important one, and I propose to invite your attention to some neglected aspects of it during this Advent season.[1] Let us first see what the Bible has to say on the subject.

The Old Testament constantly speaks of heaven in

[1] 1893.

the plural, and when it speaks of it in the singular it is commonly in such forms of speech, expressly or by implication, as "the heaven of heavens"—that is, a universe including a variety of species. "The heaven of heavens cannot contain thee," says Solomon, in his great prayer at the dedication of the Temple. And, "Then hear thou from heaven, thy dwelling-place." And a few verses further on, "Then hear thou from the heavens, from thy dwelling-place." St. Peter, too, in his Pentecostal sermon, builds an argument on the fact that "David had not ascended into the heavens"; and St. Stephen in his dying speech declares: "Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." St. Paul speaks of himself as having been "caught up to the third heaven," which he presently identifies with "Paradise." And the highest authority of all, our Lord's own prayer, recognizes the plurality of heaven in the words—as they ought to be rendered—"Our Father, who art in the heavens." Many other references will readily occur to you; but these will suffice to show that our Lord's words in the text are only an explicit assertion of what the language of the Old and New Testament implies.

Another fallacy, equally opposed to Holy Scripture and right reason, is the prevalent notion that men

undergo some great change in the moment of death. In this world men of great saintliness and men of great wickedness are comparatively rare. The bulk of mankind are persons of mixed character, varying in infinite degrees, from incorrigible selfishness to supreme sanctity. It is impossible for any mortal eye to draw a line through this mass and say that all on one side of the line are lost and all on the other side of it are saved. But the instincts of our own hearts and the large charity of the Church, as expressed in the Burial Service, prompt us to include as many as possible on the right side of the line. We hope for the best in every case, and dare not say or even think of any soul, that it is finally lost. Yet we feel that many of whose salvation we feel bound to hope are far from fit for the presence-chamber of Him who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity. What then? Are they to be suddenly transformed in the hour of death from sinners into saints? That seems to be the belief of some. But surely there is no ground for it either in Scripture or in reason. To be saved is not necessarily to be fit at once for the presence of "the King in His beauty." A shipwrecked mariner is saved when he has reached the shore naked and bruised and bleeding and helpless; but he is not therefore at

once on an equality as regards health with those who have not been shipwrecked. A sick man is saved when his malady has been mastered; but it may take him years to reach the state of health from which he has fallen. So it is in the spiritual life. Death makes no change in the character of any one. Just as the body grows from infancy to maturity by slow but ceaseless addition of atoms, so does the character. There is no advance by leaps and bounds in the one case any more than in the other. It is a matter of gradual development. As the man dies, so he appears in the spiritual world There is no change, no breach of continuity with the life on earth. It is simply the earthly life carried into the spiritual world apart from the body. The life itself will remain just as it was, with the same desires, passions, propensities, habits, and character. The man will have lost nothing but his body, and that will not affect his character, for character belongs to the soul, which will open its eyes in the world beyond the grave in precisely the same moral condition in which it left the body. Undoubtedly the soul will grow in the next world—for growth is an inalienable law of intellectual life—but it will be a gradual process, requiring time. Dives was the same man in Hades that he had been on earth, and so was Lazarus.

Change of scene made no change in the character of either.

Look, again, at the multitude of human beings who have never, so to speak, had a chance of preparing themselves for heaven. Consider the millions of heathen who, without any fault of their own, have passed, and will yet pass, out of this life ignorant of God and of their responsibility to Him. Think also of the myriads of men, women, and children in the great cities of Christendom, whose environment is such that they have no opportunity of living—I will not say Christian, but—moral lives; who are vicious from ignorance and circumstances rather than from deliberate choice. What is to become of all these? They are obviously unfit for the presence of Him whom the pure in heart alone can see. Yet our moral sense and our belief in a God of love and righteousness forbid the thought that they must perish. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" And may we not ask, in the beautiful language of the woman of Tekoah, whether it is likely that a God, whose mercy is over all His works, and who is no respecter of persons, will fail to "devise means that His banished be not expelled from Him"?[1] Let us not doubt that for all who sin

[1] 2 Sam. xiv. 14.

through invincible ignorance in faith or morals a place of repentance and amendment will yet be found in one of the "many mansions" provided by the Father of all. And must we not also believe that a dwelling-place suitable to their needs will likewise be provided for those imperfect characters of whom I have spoken; persons of good intentions but of week and wavering wills—the result perhaps of ancestral sins—struggling against temptation, with but indifferent success, till death overtakes them? No one can perish in whom any spark of the Divine life is still burning. No one can be plucked out of the Saviour's hands who still struggles towards Him, however feebly and falteringly.

But such souls are manifestly unfit for the mansions of saints and angels, nor could they be happy there. They need a different dwelling-place, a lower school to make them "meet for the inheritance of the saints in light." And there are degrees of excellence in the characters and capacities even of saints, and therefore gradations in their occupation and glory in heaven, just as there are in the hierarchy of angels. Very little is revealed to us about the heavenly host. But we are told that they differ in power, in capacity, in authority and dignity, in fervour of love, in nearness to God. They are classified into angels,

archangels, dominions, principalities, powers, cherubim and seraphim, and the guardian angels of children, who, our Lord tells us, "do always behold the face of His Father in heaven;" implying that there are angels who do not always behold His face.

And here let me notice in passing the singular reticence, so different from the detailed descriptions of other religious books, which the writers of the Bible observe in all their references to the future world. How natural it would have been for the author of the fourth Gospel to describe the experiences of Lazarus during the interval between his death and resurrection, or to enter more fully into the life and conversation of Jesus during His forty days' sojourn on earth before the Ascension. How natural also for St. Paul to record in detail his temporary translation into Paradise. The temptation would in both cases have been irresistible, as would also the temptation to describe at length the childhood of our Lord and His life as a carpenter in Nazareth, if the narratives were spurious or the writers uninspired. This holy reserve is most marked where we should least expect or desire it. Take the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles alone, and consider how any other writers would have dealt with the facts. The story embraces scenes and circumstances and personages

which whet the curiosity of the reader continually, and are calculated to arouse emotions of sorrow, or wonder, or indignation. Yet these writers relate everything with the same absence of high colouring and exaggerated description with which other writers notice the ordinary occurrences of life. And let it be remembered that they were personally and deeply concerned—and if they only professed to be, the temptation would be stronger—in the events which they relate. Even the crucifixion of their Master is described with a sobriety and brevity scarcely possible in ordinary circumstances. Not one burst of indignation, or sorrow, or sympathy mingles with the details of the narrative. This extraordinary self-restraint adds to the pathos of the tragedy described. But that is a result unimagined by the Evangelists, and it is inconceivable that four different biographies should all be marked by this same characteristic, if the authors were ordinary biographers. The martyrdom of Stephen is dismissed in a sentence: "They stoned Stephen, calling upon God and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." The stoning of St. Paul is described with a like frigid brevity: "And there came thither certain Jews who persuaded the people, and having stoned Paul, drew him out of the city, supposing he had been dead.

Howbeit, as the disciples stood round about him, he rose up and came into the city; and the next day he departed with Barnabas to Derbe." There is a similar absence of emotion and of detail in all references to the future life. How different from the sacred books of all other religions! Compare it with the sentimental and sensual details of the Mohammedan paradise, as described in the Koran!

The truth is that the writers of the New Testament were too much absorbed in the supernatural grandeur of their theme to think of the means subservient to it, however important those means might be. In the storm the pilot's eye is fixed on the headland which must be weathered; in the crisis of victory or defeat the general sees only the position to be carried, and bullets and men fall around him unheeded. The minds of the New Testament writers were so set on the misery of man, his need of redemption, and the satisfaction of that need in the stupendous mystery of the Incarnation, that they had no time or inclination to enter into details farther than was necessary for their main purpose. And so they tell us no more about the future life than that, as there are gradations of rank, and occupations, and an equitable distribution of rewards among the angelic host, so there will likewise be among redeemed

mankind. Men leave this world with differing capacities, endowments, qualifications; and they will each find in the world unseen the place and occupation for which they are best fitted. Each will "go to his own place" by the force of an irresistible spiritual attraction. The man found worthy to rule over ten cities will preside over ten cities, and he who is worthy to have five cities will rule over five. Our Lord promised His apostles that they should sit on thrones of authority over the twelve tribes of Israel.[1] Whatever may be the meaning of such figurative language, we may be sure that it represents great truths. And we can at least see as much as this: that heaven is not what we ordinarily mean by *a place*—a given locality that can be defined and mapped out. It is much more a state of being, a moral, spiritual, and intellectual relation to an infinite series of more and more rarefied atmospheres of purity and beauty, into which admission is gained, not by travelling through stellar spaces, but by a gradual ascent in the altitude of being. As men become purer, more loving, more spiritual, organs of perception will open out within them, which will disclose new worlds, perhaps close to them. Alps will on alps arise above them as they ascend in the scale of being. Splendours never

[1] See Appendix A.

dreamt of, wonders never imagined, will reveal themselves in every fresh mansion which the aspiring saint or angel enters. And this progress will go on for ever, for progress is the inalienable prerogative of moral and intellectual being. It is so here, at least till decay of faculties begins. But there will be no decay there. "They rest not day and night," yet they toil not; for exercise of their powers brings no exhaustion; it only invigorates and enlarges their capacity for further effort and ampler enjoyment. It is otherwise in this life, where energy means waste of tissue, and necessitates a fresh supply. Hence the need of sleep that ends care and frees from toil, that soothes the fever and worry of daily life, that begins in weariness and ends in strength, that lulls soul and body in gentle repose till God fills again the exhausted lamp of life. But there will be no waste of tissue, no exhaustion of life, when "this mortal shall have put on immortality," and "death is swallowed up in victory." Here man's progress, even the progress of the best of us, is never straight onward, but commonly tortuous, and often interrupted. The right road is often missed, and time is wasted, and energy also, in retracing steps to the parting of the ways. In the heavens progress is continuous and uninterrupted; so that he who arrives fit only for the lowest room will

by-and-by reach the highest, while he who has passed at once to the highest attainable on leaving this earth will yet mount higher and higher as the faculties expand by unwearied activity, always getting nearer, though never getting near, the uncreated source of all life and energy, of all beauty and joy.

VI.

II.—THE MANY MANSIONS OF THE SPIRITUAL REALM.

"In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you."—JOHN xiv. 2.

WE saw last Sunday, on the authority of our Lord, and as a natural inference of our own reason, that heaven is not a place into which every human being who dies in the grace of God passes at once in the moment of death; but is, on the contrary, a universe of many spheres, suited to the vast varieties of character, capacity, and occupation of its inhabitants. To-day we will consider the question of the Intermediate State and the condition of the soul in the interval between death and the final judgment. Whither does the soul go when it leaves the body? And what is its condition there? That the souls even of those who die in grace do not go straight to heaven—that is, into the immediate presence of

Almighty God—is evident from Holy Scripture, as we shall presently see; and our own reason suggests the same conclusion. Admission to the Beatific Vision at the moment of death would be impossible to all—probably even to the greatest saints—and, if possible, would be intolerable. Let us remember how necessary previous preparation is for any sudden change, even in this life. The use of our bodily senses is now so natural to us that we forget the long and tedious apprenticeship through which we passed in learning it. No one can become proficient in any trade or profession without passing through a period of training for it. Nor can any one get used to strange society, or feel at home in it, without some previous education. A peasant would feel uncomfortable and unhappy in a royal mansion, if placed there without any experience of a kindred nature beforehand. A person taken from a higher social grade would feel more at home, and would learn more readily the manners of a court, because his experience was not so dissimilar.

Remember that death makes no breach in the continuity of any life. Freedom from the limitations and fetters of bodily life may, indeed, stimulate and quicken the mental and moral powers; but the character will remain unchanged. Now, if you try

to realize who and what God is, you will see how unreasonable it is to suppose that even the holiest of creatures could be suddenly ushered into His presence without overwhelming pain and confusion. The sight would be too much for endurance. Even the heathen felt this, and have left us some beautiful legends to illustrate the pain and peril of sudden and unprepared contact between the human nature and the divine: the story of Semele, for example, and the Greek belief in dementia caused by the sudden apparition of spiritual beauty—"the nympholepsy of a fond despair." And you remember how the mere reflection of the Divine glory on the face of Moses made it impossible for the eyes of the children of Israel to endure the sight of it? What wonder, when you think on the reality, of which the reflected glory was so faint a shadow? The great astronomer, Sir John Herschell, tells a story of the painful effect of a sudden vision of surpassing beauty on himself. One night, as he was scanning a cloudless sky with his large telescope, the bright star Sirius, in all its splendour, passed across the disc of his glass, and the unexpected sight of such unwonted beauty smote him with such pain that he was obliged to withdraw his eyes from the firmament to prevent his fainting. If created beauty,

suddenly revealed, can have such overpowering effect how could any human being endure, unconsumed, the unveiled beauty of Him who is the uncreated source of all that is beautiful, and powerful, and majestic? Think of the wonders of even the small portion of the visible creation which is open to our view; how it everywhere bears innumerable traces of the Creator's power, glory, majesty, skill, and, above all, perhaps, of His love of beauty for its own sake. Evidence of power, indeed, there is everywhere; in the tiniest blade of grass or the ripple that breaks upon the shore, as in the earthquake that overwhelms cities, or the tempest that casts its wrecks upon the beach. And the evidence of skill throughout creation is as conspicuous as the evidence of power. But neither the skill nor the power to which creation witnesses is as impressive as the profusion with which the Almighty Maker has spread over all His works an endless and a boundless beauty. Doubtless much of this beauty is intended for the solace and delight of man—perhaps, also, of some of the lower animals; but the greater part of it seems to have no other end than the pleasure of Him who made it. How exquisite is the beauty of shells! Yet what a minute fraction of the shells that line the shores and floors of seas and oceans are ever

seen by the eye of man! Consider also the numberless flowers that bud and bloom and perish unseen—not only their collective beauty in the mass, but the inimitable beauty of each in every fibre and petal. The telescope and the microscope have shown how infinite all this wealth of beauty is, as well in its minuteness as in its magnitude. But more wonderful even than the prodigality of beauty of form and colour which overspreads the whole of nature is the mysterious beauty of music. Mysterious, indeed, it is in every way. In almost all substances there is lodged a capacity for sound. Strike any solid substance, and in addition to the sound caused by the vibrating air you will hear a note that belongs to the thing itself. The pipes in the organ simply yield up what their original substances contained. Man only develops what was within them; just as the coal which is extracted from the bowels of the earth, when set on fire, merely liberates the heat and light which in the forest it received from the sun. Various woods yield various sounds, as the violinist knows. And there is also the sound of falling or running water; of wind whistling or moaning through reeds and trees; of waves breaking on the barren strand; of birds, and insects, and animals. Go back in creation as far as you like—to a hoary past, when

there was no ear to hear—and you will find this capacity for sound in all material things: no music, properly so called, as yet, but only its materials and laws, waiting for man to give them articulate expression. How profound is the Apostle's representation of "the whole creation groaning and travailing in pain," but also "in hope" of sharing man's deliverance from "the bondage of corruption." And how it enlarges our idea of redemption to learn that it embraces the whole creation; that as all nature felt the wound of man's transgression, so all nature should, in a sense, yearn for the promised deliverance. But nowhere does "the earnest expectation of the creation, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God," show itself so plainly as in the speechless music locked within nature, and pleading to be let out in song and praise through the agency of man.

Now consider that all this wonderful abundance and variety of beauty of form and colour and sound are but an infinitesimal part of the visible creation, and that the visible creation itself is but a dim reflection of glories which lie behind it; and then think what that Being must be from whom it all came, and who sustains it from moment to moment, pervading every atom of it with His presence, yet absolutely separate from it; under everything, yet above all

things. Imagine, as far as human faculties can imagine, the awful glory, the incommunicable splendour, the dazzling, blinding beauty of such a Presence; and then conceive how impossible it would be for even the holiest of human beings to be ushered, without due preparation, into the presence-chamber of the Great Being from whom all things proceed. "The outer darkness," of which our Lord speaks, would be nothing in comparison with the scorching darkness from overpowering light, with which the Beatific Vision would afflict eyes unprepared for its uncreated beauty.

So much our own reason suggests, and the Bible supplies various illustrations of it. When man fell he was driven out from direct intercourse with his Maker, because, in his fallen condition, God would have been a consuming fire to him. When Moses beheld the burning bush on Horeb, and was about to examine the wonderful sight more closely, the Divine voice warned him off, and bade him behave with reverence, because the very precincts of the burning bush was "holy ground." And why did the bush burn, yet remain unconsumed, while Moses would have been consumed had he approached it? Because there was nothing in the bush antagonistic to the will of God, whereas in the will of mortal man, even at his best,

there is an element of discord, something out of tune with the will of God. It was doubtless in memory of this incident in his life that Moses describes God as "a consuming fire," a description which is repeated in the New Testament. Nature, in all her series, obeys the will of Him who made her, and can therefore bear His presence unconsumed. Not so man. He must become pure in heart before he can see God. So holy a man as Daniel could not bear the presence of one of God's angels till he was supernaturally strengthened. And when "the disciple whom Jesus loved" saw his Divine Master in glory, he "fell at His feet as dead," till the sustaining hand of the Saviour enabled him to bear the vision. Indeed, so strongly did the Church of the first ages recognize the need of preparation in the intermediate state for admission into heaven, that it regarded martyrs, and even the Blessed Virgin, as still in Hades with the rest of the faithful departed, and, with them, fit subjects for the prayers of the Church on earth.

The Bible, differing in this respect from the sacred books of all other religions, is exceedingly reserved in its language about the unseen world and its inhabitants. It speaks of Gehenna as the abode of lost spirits, without making it clear whether any human beings go into it before the Day of Judgment.

Heaven, in the singular or plural, is sometimes used of the whole spiritual world outside the realm of the lost. At other times a distinction is made. The intermediate state is called Hades, which means the invisible place, and is sometimes used in a comprehensive sense for the abode alike of saints and sinners, between whom, however, there is said to be "a great gulf fixed." In the story of Dives and Lazarus, it is in Hades that the rich man is said to have "lifted up his eyes, being in torment." But he sees, albeit across a great gulf, Lazarus in Abraham's bosom. When St. Peter quotes David as prophesying that his soul should not be left in hell, Hades is the word in the original. And when St. Paul, adapting the language of Hosea, exclaims triumphantly, "Where, O death, is thy sting? where, O grave, thy victory?" the word translated "grave" is Hades. The word, therefore, includes the abode of good and bad (whether of all bad is not clear) in the interval between death and the resurrection. There is another word used for the intermediate state—the Persian word "Paradise," which means a pleasure-garden or park. It is used exclusively for the abode of the blessed. "To-day," said our Lord to the penitent thief, "shalt thou be with Me in Paradise," which plainly did not mean the dwelling-place of the saints after the great judgment

as of the angels now; for into that heaven Jesus did not ascend till forty days afterwards. St. Paul says that he was himself caught up into the third heaven, which he identifies with Paradise, and heard there words that it was "not possible to utter" in the language of earth. It is remarkable that, in His message to the Church of Ephesus, our Lord uses again the word with which He comforted the dying robber. "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God," an evident allusion to the Garden of Eden as a Paradise restored. And as man was there in a state of imperfection, undergoing training for heaven, the natural inference is that the passage refers to the intermediate state.[1]

There is another passage bearing on our subject which demands consideration, both because it is very significant, and is also the subject of some controversy. I mean 1 Peter iii. 18, 19, 20. I will read it first in the Authorized Version: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the

[1] Appendix B.

long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water." This is misleading, if what it suggests is that God the Holy Ghost preached through Noah to the men of that generation; and that is the interpretation which some modern commentators put upon the passage. But it is an interpretation which can hardly be reconciled with the grammatical construction of the original, and which is opposed to the almost unanimous opinion of the Fathers of the early Church.[1] What St. Peter really says is, that Christ "being put to death in the flesh, and endowed with life in the spirit," that is, His own human spirit, went in that spirit and preached to the spirits in prison; in other words, that in the interval between His death and resurrection His life-giving soul went into Hades, and proclaimed the glad tidings of redemption to the generation to whom Noah had preached in vain. The meaning of the passage does not lie on the surface,

[1] St. Augustine is the first, and the only great name among the Fathers, who suggests the interpretation which I am combating ("Epist. ad Evod."). Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, Origen, Ambrose, Jerome—in short, all the great Fathers of the East and West are against Augustine; and Dante embodies the universal belief of Christendom when he represents Christ as descending into the region of the lost and delivering the spirits of Adam, Abel, Noah, the patriarchs, and the saints of the Old Covenant ("Inferno," iv 52–63).

but a little consideration will probably make it plain. The words to which I wish to call your attention are, "being put to death in the flesh, but quickened"—that is, endowed with life, or made alive—"in the spirit, in which He also went and preached to the spirits in prison." Man is divisible into body, soul, and spirit. Through his body he is in communion with matter, organic and inorganic. Through his soul he is in communion with the animal creation. Through his spirit he is in communion with moral, intellectual, and Divine life. He is thus in touch with the whole universe of being, ranging from the dust of the ground to the Divine nature. Hence the reason of the Divine Son's Incarnation. He "took not on Him the nature of angels, but of the seed of Abraham He layeth hold." The assumption of the nature of angels would not have put Him in touch with human nature and the lower creation. But by taking on Him the nature of man He put Himself in touch with the whole creation. And so St. Paul, in a bold figure, represents, as we have seen, "the whole creation" as groaning in travail, waiting for the final accomplishment of the redemption wrought by Christ, not for man alone, but for the whole visible creation. And the Apostle, in his great chapter on the Resurrection, throws some additional light on the passage under consideration. He draws a

sharp distinction between what our Authorized Version calls the "natural body" and the "spiritual body," but which would be more correctly rendered, "the body which is governed by the laws of the soul, and the body which is governed by the laws of the spirit." To understand this you must remember what I said just now about man's tripartite nature—body, soul, and spirit. It is through his soul that man is allied to the animal world. Animals have a kind of soul as distinct from their bodies, an immaterial principle of life distinct from matter. What becomes of this at death the Bible does not, and science cannot, tell us. Whether it is absorbed into the general ocean of life, or retains some separate concrete existence, we know not. We only know that no life perishes in the sense of ceasing to be. Now man, as I have said, has an animal soul, but he has, in addition, what no animal has, a God-granted spirit, capable of holding communion with his Maker. Thus we read in Genesis ii. 7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." It was this in-breathing of Divine life that differentiated man from the lower animals, and endowed him with life in addition to the mere existence which he had previously possessed. The plants and animals God had endowed

with existence, but He determined to make man in His own image, and therefore He superadded to the gift of the lower animal life the higher life of the spirit.

And now we come to the distinction which St. Paul draws between the first Adam and the second. "The first man, Adam," he says, "was made into a living soul; the second Adam into a life-giving spirit." There you have St. Paul's explanation of the distinction between the natural body and the spiritual—that is, a body under the dominion of the animal soul, and a body under the dominion of the spirit. The former is necessarily conditioned by the laws and limitations of the material world; the other is conditioned only by the laws of the spiritual world. Fallen man is in the former category; Christ, the second Adam, is in the latter. Our Lord's humanity was thus, even before His death, in its essence spiritual. He chose to submit to the laws of the natural creation—the laws of growth; waste of tissue and need of reparation by food and sleep; travelling through space like other men, and so forth. Yet, when occasion required it, He emancipated Himself from the laws of this lower world. He walked on water, against the laws of gravity. He made Himself invisible at will, against the laws of optics. He was transfigured on the

Mount. When He uttered the great name by which He had made Himself known to Moses on Horeb, the soldiers sent to apprehend Him fell on their faces to the ground, and had no power to seize Him till He willed it so to be. And it was by an act of volition, not of necessity, that He died upon the cross. "I lay down my life," He said. "No one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." In Him there was no sin; therefore no germ of corruption or decay, and consequently death had no dominion over Him. He submitted voluntarily to the doom of the race which He came to save. Even on the cross it was Himself, when all was finished, who yielded up His Spirit. It was "with a loud voice," not with the expiring sigh of dying men, that He surrendered His soul into His Father's hands. Death could not, even then, vanquish Him till He gave leave; could not wrest His soul from Him till He consented. Here, then, we have the explanation of the passage in St. Peter's Epistle: "Being put to death in the flesh, but endowed with life in the spirit, in which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison." That is to say, while the first Adam had only a living soul —*i.e.* a life imparted from without—the second Adam, being Himself, as St. Peter elsewhere calls Him, "the

Prince of Life" (having an inherent, not a derivative life), had always a life-giving spirit, and in that spirit went and proclaimed the good tidings of salvation to the spirits in prison in Hades.

VII.

III.—THE MANY MANSIONS OF THE SPIRITUAL REALM.

"*In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.*"—JOHN xiv. 2.

WE have to consider to-day the condition of the faithful departed in the intermediate state between death and the resurrection. Are they conscious? Do they know what is passing on earth? Is there mutual recognition in the spiritual world? I mean, does a soul, on entering the spiritual world, know intuitively all those whom he meets, as well as those whom he has known on earth? And do they know who he is? Are souls in the intermediate state in a perfect or in an imperfect condition? Are they capable of progress, and of an increase of happiness, and can the prayers of the living benefit them? How are they employed? Are there different spheres of

life in the intermediate state, as there appear to be in heaven? And if so, does that necessarily imply, in either place, a separation between souls of different spiritual capacities who have known and loved each other on earth—husbands and wives, parents and children, and the like? What do we mean by the Communion of Saints, in which we profess our belief every time we repeat the Apostles' Creed? What is meant by the Beatific Vision? And do souls in the intermediate state enjoy it?

These are questions which sometimes come unbidden into our minds, especially in seasons of sorrow and bereavement; and it may be profitable to consider them in the light of Holy Scripture as interpreted by the Primitive Church; for that is the criterion by which our Church bids us test the soundness of all doctrines or inferences which are not plainly matters of necessary faith. The time at our disposal will not allow me to deal exhaustively with so large a subject; but perhaps I may be able to treat it from some points of view with which some of you are perhaps not familiar, and which may help you to realize better than you have hitherto done the nature and character of that "life of the world to come," of which the Creed speaks. Let us, then, begin with the first of the questions which I have asked.

1. Are souls conscious in the intermediate state? But for the fact that able and devout Christians have held the contrary opinion, it would seem hardly necessary to ask such a question; so natural is it to believe that the soul retains its consciousness in its disembodied condition. That this belief is a natural instinct of the human heart is apparent from its universality. It is the belief of heathendom and Judaism, as well as of the Christian Church. Some of you will remember a noble passage in which Plato represents Socrates as welcoming the death to which he had been unjustly condemned, because it would introduce him to the society of some illustrious persons who had passed before him into the unseen world, and with whom it would be a great delight to converse. But let us see what Holy Scripture has to say on the subject. We learn from our Lord that Moses inculcated this doctrine "at the Bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; for He is not the God of the dead, but of the living. For all live unto Him." But a state of complete unconsciousness, if not death, is certainly not life. The apparition of dead Samuel to Saul, too, in the witch's cave at Endor, however we explain it, implies belief in the consciousness of the soul after death, and of its knowledge of what is

happening and is about to happen on earth. We have another indication of the consciousness of the departed in the translation of Elijah, while talking with Elisha, without undergoing the process of dissolution. It may be true that the Jews in the mass held the doctrine vaguely and uncertainly; and even pious and thoughtful Jews, like King Hezekiah, appear to have had doubts upon the subject when death approached them. But the passages to which I have referred show that the consciousness of disembodied souls was implied, if not explicitly taught, in their Scriptures.

The New Testament, as we might expect, speaks more plainly. The story of Dives and Lazarus leaves us in no doubt as to what our Lord wished us to believe. The Rich Man, and Lazarus, and Abraham are all represented as in the full enjoyment of consciousness and mental activity. In the Transfiguration scene, again, we find Moses and Elijah talking to Jesus about His approaching Passion: the great lawgiver of Israel, and the brave prophet who was raised up to vindicate that law and to be the prototype of the Messiah's forerunner, appropriately meeting Him in whom all the Law and Prophets were about to be fulfilled. Our Lord's promise to the penitent robber is another side-light on the

subject, plainly implying consciousness on the part of disembodied souls. And St. Peter's declaration that Jesus went and "preached unto the spirits in prison" —that is, the generation who disregarded the preaching of Noah—is a still more emphatic assertion of the continued consciousness of the soul after death. St. Paul echoes the same belief when he desires "to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better," as well as in his account of his temporary translation to Paradise, though he could not tell "whether in the body or out of the body." The souls under the altar too, in the Apocalyptic vision, are conscious, for they cry for retribution on the persecutors of the Church on earth, and are soothed with white robes and a message of peace. I need only add that the Catholic Church has always taught, or rather assumed, as a self-evident truth, the conscious existence of the soul after death. We may therefore say that the doctrine is attested by our natural instincts, by the universal testimony of the human race, by Holy Scripture, and by the Church of Christ throughout the world.

2. But are souls in Paradise conscious of what is passing on earth? Here the evidence from Holy Scripture is not so clear: it is more indirect and inferential. We have seen that Samuel was cognizant in Paradise of the course of events in Israel since his

departure, and of the impending death in battle of Saul and his sons after the defeat of the King's army by the Philistines. I think we may gather from the narrative of the Transfiguration, brief as it is, that Moses and Elijah had knowledge of the Incarnation and Passion, which would seem to mean knowledge of our Lord's life on earth, past and to come. The souls under the altar were made unhappy by the continued persecution of their brethren on earth; which of course implies knowledge. It was in the invisible world, and before He joined them, that Jesus heard the conversation of the two disciples as they were walking sadly to Emmaus. And when Thomas protested that nothing would convince him of his Master's resurrection but the sight of the nail-prints in His hands and the touch of the spear-wound in His side, he little knew that his words were audible in the spiritual realm, and were heard by Him from Whom the doubting Apostle, out of the very passion of his despairing love, demanded this carnal proof of His victory over death. No hint is given that this knowledge reached our Lord in the spiritual world through the medium of His Divine nature. We are rather left to infer that it reached Him as knowledge of events on earth reached Samuel, and Moses, and Elijah, and the souls of martyrs in Paradise.

So far, then, as Holy Scripture has shed any light upon the subject, it encourages us to believe that departed spirits do enjoy some means of communication with the world which they have left. That also would seem to be the view of the Church always, of which we have an indication in the Trisagion:—"Therefore with angels, and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious Name;" and in the Article of the Creed which asserts "the Communion of Saints," that is, the unbroken fellowship of the Church on earth and the Church in Paradise. See, too, how strong a hold that view had on St. Paul's mind. In his belief the faithful on earth and the faithful in Paradise were still one company—"the whole family in heaven and on earth." The fact that we are not conscious of our nearness to the inhabitants of the spiritual world no more proves their absence or distance from us than the inability of Elisha's servant to see with his natural eyes the angelic host that guarded his master proved that it was not there. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says expressly that the spirits of the departed are watching the struggles of Christians still on earth. After an eloquent summary of the sufferings and bravery of some of the saints of the Old Testament, he exclaims, "Therefore let us also,

seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, lay aside every weight and the sin which so easily besets us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us."

The "cloud of witnesses" (literally "martyrs")[1] evidently refers to the multitude of departed saints, on whom he had just been pronouncing a glowing panegyric, and the image is taken from contests in the Olympian games. The passage came vividly home to me twenty months ago[2] as I sat on the rising ground from which the "great cloud of witnesses" from all the Grecian lands watched with such keen interest the animated spectacle before them. Overlooking the plain was a background of towering mountains; in the distance the sparkling sea; through the enchanted vale the winding river; flanking one side of the arena a group of glorious temples and a crowd of statues, including the famous Hermes of Praxiteles and many other masterpieces of Greek art; in the midst the competitors for immortal fame; and scattered all round the many-coloured "cloud of witnesses" ready to applaud the victors. Such was the scene before the mind of the inspired writer when he penned his illustration of the Christian's warfare. And it would be difficult to express more emphatically his intense

[1] See Appendix C. [2] April, 1892.

realization of the closeness of the departed to us, and their lively interest in the battle against sin, the world, and the devil, in which we all are, or ought to be, engaged. The mistake we make in reasoning on such subjects is that we are apt to measure spiritual possibilities by our knowledge of natural laws. But the truth is that natural laws have no relation at all to the spiritual world.

And yet, on the other hand, our experience of the laws which govern this world may help us wonderfully to realize the mysteries of the spiritual kingdom. What can be more marvellous, when you think of it, than the undoubted fact that all the atoms of which this earth is composed are in such close correspondence with each other that two atoms, separated by the whole breadth of the globe, are, without intermission, mutually attracting each other as if nothing intervened?

Then consider the rapidity with which discoveries in modern physical science have enabled men to communicate with each other at immense distances. If you were to lay an electric wire round the earth, you could send a message through it that would flash seven times round the earth in a second. That means in effect the annihilation of space. Such are some of the wonders which man's mastery over nature has

revealed to us; and we are probably on the threshold of greater marvels still. And yet we think it strange and incomprehensible that spirits, who are infinitely more subtle and ethereal than any material force, should be able to hold communication with the earth which they have left, or be able to learn the passing events of a world so full to them of varied memories! We believe—science forces us to believe—in the communion of dead atoms wide asunder as the poles, yet we find it hard to believe in the communion of saints—in the nearness to us of those who have simply passed out of sight.

The laws of matter, remember, do not exist for spiritual beings. For them there is no such thing as distance or nearness. They do not go from place to place by locomotion. They do not *travel* at all in our sense of the word. Within the sphere of their finite conditions, they are instantaneously wherever they wish to be. Space and time no more impede them than they impede your thought, which reaches any part of the globe in a moment. In short, the researches of scientific men have now proved that there are innumerable sights and sounds, colours and voices, in this world which we inhabit, of which we are not cognizant merely because we have no organs fine enough to apprehend them. A distinguished

Professor of Natural Science says:—"When we reflect that there are waves of light and sound of which our dull senses take no cognizance; that there is a great difference even in human perceptivity, and that some men, more gifted than their fellows, can see colours and hear sounds which are invisible or inaudible to the great bulk of mankind; you will appreciate how possible it is that there may be a world of spiritual existence around us, inhabiting this globe, enjoying the same nature; in fact, the wonders of New Jerusalem may be in our midst, and the songs of the angelic host filling the air with their celestial harmonies, although unseen and unheard by us." Another distinguished man of science, who was President of the British Association some years ago, and who happens to be also a distinguished lawyer, uses these words in a treatise on the "Correlation of Physical Forces:"—"Myriads of organized beings may exist, imperceptibly to our vision, even if we were among them."

Is not that an awful thought? We are never alone. The air around us is resonant with voices which we do not hear, tremulous with the vibration of shapes moving to and fro, which we do not see. How cautious, how reverent, the thought should make us. St. Stephen saw the heavens

opened, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God. Do you suppose that the dying martyr's eyes pierced the stellar spaces and penetrated into a world beyond them? No; the heavens into which he gazed were not separated from him by distance in space — for they have no relation to space—but by difference of spiritual condition; and the rift through which he beheld them was made in him, not in them. His spirit was enabled to see through its bodily tabernacle into the spiritual world. And when the persecuting Saul heard the voice of Jesus calling to him out of heaven, it was not with his bodily ears that he heard it, but with a spiritual sense. We may reasonably conclude, therefore, from various intimations in the Bible, from the probabilities of the case, and from the light cast upon the subject by modern science, that souls in the intermediate state may be cognizant of what is going on in this world.

3. But may we go on to say that there is mutual recognition in the intermediate state? Do souls, on arriving in the spiritual world, know by intuition every one they meet? That seems to have been the belief of the heathen generally; certainly of the Greeks. Not to multiply examples, Socrates, in a passage already referred to, takes pleasure in the prospect of soon meeting and conversing with Orpheus

and Ulysses, and others of the illustrious dead whose lives and characters interested him. But what does the Bible say? Does it encourage the hope that we shall know at once the souls we meet when we leave this earth? Like will be attracted to like there undoubtedly much more than here. Can we, like the dying sage of Athens, take comfort when our end is near in the thought that we shall soon find ourselves in the company of some of those who have attracted us in history.

How delightful to be able to recognize at once and be allowed to talk with Joseph, with David, "the sweet singer of Israel," with Daniel and Isaiah, with the Evangelist John, and with the great Apostle of the Gentiles! Does Holy Scripture encourage any such hope? Certainly it does so far as the question of recognition goes. Dives in Hades recognized at once not only the beggar Lazarus, but Abraham also, whom he had never seen before; and the three disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration recognized Moses and Elijah as they talked with Jesus. There is here implied some means of recognition of which we have but faint experience now—the touch of spirit by spirit. Very remarkable are the accounts of Christ's various appearances after His Resurrection. He was the same, yet different. Mary Magdalene

did not recognize Him at the tomb even when He talked with her. She supposed that He was the gardener till He called her by her name, and probably in the old tone of voice she remembered so well. We read that He appeared to His disciples on one occasion "in another form." And He walked, and talked, and argued, and ate with the two disciples who went to Emmaus without their recognizing Him until He chose to be known. When He appeared, too, on the shore of the Lake of Galilee as some of His disciples were fishing, they did not know Him, although they had seen Him twice before after His resurrection. He spoke to them, asked them if they had any food, bade them "cast the net on the right side of the ship, and they should find." Yet they knew Him not till the disciple whom Jesus loved, with that superior sensitiveness which deeper love imparts, divined the truth and whispered it to Peter. But it is evident that even then their recognition of Him was spiritual rather than bodily; for we read that when they joined Him on shore, "none of the disciples durst ask Him, who art thou? knowing that it was the Lord." That is to say, their spiritual understanding recognized Him, but His bodily form was strange to them. The Roman guard, who watched His tomb for the purpose of keeping Him imprisoned, did not

see Him as He passed them. To the sceptical Thomas, and even to the other disciples who were so slow to recognize Him, He exhibited the visible marks of His Passion. Mary Magdalene, on the other hand, He commanded not to touch Him. She recognized Him through the intensity of her love the moment He pronounced her name, and needed no visible and tangible proof of His identity; and, accordingly, no such proof was vouchsafed to her. To each He appeared according to the spiritual state of each. A certain spiritual condition is necessary to the reception of spiritual truth, and the degree of light granted is regulated by the spiritual sensitiveness of the recipient. Spirit is not like matter, inflexible and inert, always retaining the same form; it is mobile, ever changing, plastic, adapting itself to all the progressive stages of spiritual development, and therefore representative and reflective, and ever responsive to our existing state. We may conclude then that recognition in the spiritual world will be by means of spiritual apprehension rather than by such bodily proofs of identity as we are familiar with here, and that souls there will know each other by that kind of intuition which is independent of sense and superior to reason, and of which we have occasional glimpses in this world.

VIII.

IV.—THE MANY MANSIONS OF THE SPIRITUAL REALM.

"*In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.*"—JOHN xiv. 2.

WE are to consider this evening the condition of souls in Paradise. Their probation is over; their salvation is assured; but is their condition perfect? In attempting an answer to that question it is necessary to bear in mind that perfection is a relative term. In strictness of speech God alone is perfect, and it is at His perfection that our Lord bids us aim. "Be ye perfect," He says, "as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Of course, He does not mean that the creature can ever reach the perfection of the Creator. He means that the perfection of man consists in ceaseless striving after infinite perfection. The perfection of every creature lies in fulfilling the end of

its existence. The perfection of a tree lies in attaining the full height, and girth, and vigour of which it is capable. The perfection of an animal lies in the fullest development of all its powers. The perfection of man is not a state, but a process, and consists in endless progress towards an ever-receding goal. It is a relative, not an absolute perfection. He must be always, as the Bible puts it, "going on"—literally "pressing forward"—"to perfection." The goal is infinitely distant, and can never be reached; and man's perfection will therefore consist in progressive desire and effort, resulting in enlargement of faculties accompanied by increased enjoyment. And this progression will of necessity go on for ever: it is an essential attribute of human life everywhere. Man's aspiration, his ideal, his aim, is infinite perfection; an attraction ever luring him on, and ever receding as he advances. In this man differs from all kinds of life below him. They are satisfied when their bodily wants are supplied. Man is never satisfied. Every fresh acquisition kindles a desire for more. In that sense man is always, and will always remain, imperfect; and therein lies his happiness. To satisfy him were to make him miserable. It is not true that "man never is, but always to be, blessed." In heaven he is always blessed. Every step in his

endless progress is a new accession of bliss; and not the least part of the blessing is the incentive to fresh effort. But it is true that man never is, but always to be, perfect.

Every one would admit that, in this sense, the faithful departed in Paradise are imperfect. But are they imperfect in the sense of anything being lacking to their happiness? There will be nothing lacking to the happiness of the saints in heaven. They will be "as the angels," whose happiness is complete at each step of their endless progression. This fulness of happiness does not appear to be enjoyed even by the highest saints in Paradise. They long for, but do not yet obtain, a blessing which they know to be in store for them. We read at the close of the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the glorious faith and sufferings of the saints of old are described, that there was still something lacking to the full measure of their happiness. "And these all, having had witness borne to them through their faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing concerning us that, apart from us, they should not be made perfect." This is a deep saying, and, like many passages of Holy Scripture, probably holds more than one meaning and lesson, each of them true, and each important.

There is first the lesson that no man's life is complete in itself, but finds its completion in others; helping to complete the past, and being itself completed by the future. No man's life can be estimated as an isolated unit. He is one of a vast family, part of which is in this world, but by far the largest portion in the world unseen. Herein lies one great difference between man and the lower creation. They begin life each as if it were the first of its species, with no gathered experience from the generations that went before. But man reaps the labours of bygone ages. He is a debtor to the past and a benefactor to the future. The saints of old, referred to in the passage under consideration, were the highest examples of spiritual eminence in their time. They forsook all for God—country, kindred, home. But the promise was not fulfilled in them. The better thing was reserved for a distant future, and they meanwhile must remain incomplete, contributing to a glorious result of which they could not enjoy the fruits till the cycle of the redeemed was complete. They were links in a great succession of men of faith, soldiers in a noble army, falling, one by one, in a campaign extending over ages, not reaping their full reward till the victory is won and the campaign is ended. It is for their recognition of this

great law of human progress that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews praises the heroes of the old Dispensation—the law, namely, that men ought to disregard all mere personal considerations, content to be strangers and pilgrims on the earth, provided they advance thereby the progress and hasten the advent of God's kingdom of righteousness. Moses, after his forty years' wandering in the wilderness, had to be content with a distant view of the Promised Land from a mountain peak in the land of Moab. Jacob died in Egypt, satisfied that others should enjoy the glorious inheritance which he saw afar off. Joseph repined not because he was never to see the land in which he directed that his bones should find a last resting-place. Even the Father of the faithful rejoiced to see Christ's day across the span of many centuries. They all died in faith; glad to forego the present for the sake of the future, and valuing their lives chiefly in the degree in which they ministered to the good of others, and were factors in the general purpose of Almighty God towards His people. How much grander a view of faith is this than that which makes it a merely personal matter, a question of individual salvation only. As you were reminded so eloquently last Sunday evening,[1] we are to regard

[1] By the Bishop of Ripon.

ourselves as stones in a glorious building, like the stones of Solomon's Temple, which were quarried and cut and polished at a distance from their destination, and attained their beauty and completeness only when they were laid in the place designed for them, each contributing its share to the beauty of the whole building, and thus, and thus only, finding its own perfection.

There you have the condition of the saints of the old Dispensation. They "received not the promise," "in order that they without us should not be made perfect." The imperfection, you see, did not apply to their own age alone, nor to their life on earth alone; it covered the whole space between them and the consummation of all things. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the rest, were not complete in themselves or in their work. They went to the making of more perfect men, of more advanced generations; and these will in their turn contribute, through their own incompleteness, to the perfection of the whole.

The perfecting of the Christian life is therefore, in the intermediate state as well as here, a continuous process. Death does not end it; it goes on in the unseen world. We and they are necessary to each other. "They without us cannot be made perfect," nor we without them. That this was St. Paul's view

is evident from his teaching generally. Not death, but the second coming of Christ, is put forward by him as the end of the Christian's work of preparation to meet his God. Writing to the Philippians, he expresses himself "confident of this very thing, that He who hath begun a good work in you will continue it until the day of Jesus Christ." Death, you see, is not to stop the work; it is to go on until the Second Advent. This kind of imperfection, then, is shared in Paradise by all the faithful departed.

But is there any difference in their conditions? Are there gradations of moral development among them as there are here? Surely there must be, when you consider that death does not break the continuity of character. Human beings appear on the other side of death in precisely the same moral condition in which they left this world. But that means innumerable degrees of moral development. There are no cataclysms, no sudden breaks or changes, in the evolution of moral, any more than in the evolution of physical, progress. That being so, consider the multitudes of human beings who pass out of this life without any opportunity, through no fault of their own, of preparing themselves to meet their God. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." But there is no sin where there is no knowledge. Is not

this the teaching of the great Apostle of the Gentiles? "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How, then, shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" With these God will know how to deal. If our Lord went, after His death, to "preach unto the spirits in prison who were disobedient" in the time of Noah, will He not find means, in the intermediate state, to make His will known to those who never knew it here?

Then think of those germinal souls who die in infancy or early childhood. What becomes of them when they arrive in the spiritual world helpless as they left this, with characters unformed and faculties undeveloped? Our Lord tells us that children are even here, under the special guardianship of angels, who "always behold the face of His Father in heaven." And if Lazarus was carried by "the angels" to Paradise—angels specially entrusted with that duty—may we not believe that when children die they are committed to the ministry of angels specially set apart to train and educate them with a skill and tenderness which no parent on earth could rival? And is it presumptuous to surmise that tender mothers, who have been parted from

children on earth, may be employed in ministering to motherless children in Paradise? Let us remember that death makes no difference in human faculties and affections except to intensify them. Now, of all human feelings, the maternal is probably the deepest and strongest. Is it, then, unreasonable to believe that a mother's love, purified and spiritualized, may be more sympathetic and more tactful, because more experienced, than angelic love? If our Lord Himself "learned obedience by the things which He suffered," does it not stand to reason that love gained in the school of suffering must be more helpful to certain natures than love which never bore the cross? Or is it too fanciful to believe that He who "knows what is in man" may sometimes remove from earth a mother exceptionally dowered with sympathy "to succour them who succour want" in the world unseen?

We are too much accustomed to regard the spiritual world, when we think of it at all, as something unreal, shadowy, distant, with which we have nothing in common while in this world, and the inhabitants of which have lost all interest in us, as we too often have done in them. But that is a view as unreasonable as it is unscriptural. To suppose that those who have left us have ceased to interest themselves

in us is to doubt that they still remain human; whereas they have become more intensely human than they ever were here. When you think of the numberless human beings who pass into the world unseen sorely needing help and comfort, why should it be thought incredible that souls are constantly drafted from this world into the next to do some useful service there? If the little maid of Israel was torn away suddenly from her home because she was needed in Damascus to send Naaman the leper to be cured of his disease and be converted to the worship of the true God, why should He not summon whomsoever He wills to leave this world in order to fulfil some ministry of love in the next? And if Peter was sent to Joppa to enlighten Cornelius, and Philip to Gaza to interpret Isaiah to the minister of the Queen of Ethiopia, and Paul to Macedonia "to help them," why should we think it strange that men and women should be called away from this life in order to be of service in some other department of the Master's kingdom? Think you that John Baptist's useful career in Judæa was cut suddenly and prematurely short in order that he might be idle in the spiritual realm? His work here was done, and, depend upon it, work was found for him elsewhere. Or good King Josiah, killed in battle in the bloom and vigour

of his manhood, and in the very crisis of the great work of reformation which he had begun with such signal success, think you that he died for nought? That zeal like his, and purity and loyalty, had no scope and no exercise in the world into which he was called so suddenly?

Let thoughts like these comfort us when we see great benefactors of their race removed in the midst of their usefulness—men and women whom, as we think, the world can ill spare; and let us remember the message of Jesus to the owner of the ass and foal which He needed on Palm Sunday: "The Lord hath need of them, and straightway He will send them." Who would grudge Him the service of any soul whom He may deign to need in His glorious work? And He may need them, too, for their own good, calling them away, perhaps, from temptations which He knows would be injurious to them; just as a wise physician will not hesitate to send away from home a patient who needs the air and scenery of a foreign land to ward off the insidious approach of a dangerous disease. And may He not remove them also for the good of those who are left behind. Many a man and woman will thank God hereafter for the bereavement which seems so cruel now. He separates for a time that He may unite for ever. He takes our

treasures away that our hearts may follow them into the treasure-house where they are laid up secure from the ravages of moth and thief and rust.

And what shall we say of the insane—the myriads who have been born without the light of reason, or been bereft of it from no fault of their own? Can we doubt that provision is made for them in one of the "many mansions" of which our Lord speaks? Their condition here is most mysterious? They live amongst us, yet we know less of them than we do of the lower animals. Is their malady in the soul, or only in the body, or partly in both? We know not. But it seems certain that their moral and mental growth has been arrested, and that they go into the next world with wills, and intellects, and consciences untrained and undeveloped. They are not responsible, and are therefore incapable of sin, though they are sometimes capable of intense suffering. Is there no compensation for them there for the moral and intellectual darkness in which they have lived here, and for the suffering which they are often made to endure? Who that believes in God can doubt it? Who can hesitate to believe that He who made man in His own image will provide in the intermediate state some means, unknown to mortal skill, to minister to minds diseased?

And those mixed characters in whom good and evil are intermingled, falling often, but by God's grace rising again; straying from the narrow way that leads to life, yet struggling back to it? One day death overtakes them with all their imperfections upon them; loving God, attracted by His purity and goodness, but with unstable wills, and strong passions, and hurtful surroundings, and perhaps hating the sin to which in trying moments they yield. Whither do they go? What is their fate? One thing is clear. God damns no one, sends no one to hell. He has given us a nature which we may ruin, and that is hell—the most tormenting of all hells. "There is no greater pain," says the great poet of Italy, "than to remember in misery the joys that are lost." To be tormented with unappeasable desire—hunger that cannot be satisfied, thirst that can never be quenched; to feel the awful solitude of absolute selfishness, the entire absence of sympathy, the inability to give or to receive it; and then to think that it might have been otherwise, that we have none but ourselves to blame: can your imagination suggest a more frightful hell than that? But it is a hell of man's own making. Do you remember the terrible description of Judas Iscariot's end? He went "to his own place," was drawn by the irresistible attraction of his own

character towards that sphere for which he had fitted himself in this temporal scene.

At death, therefore, every soul will be drawn by spiritual attraction towards the particular abode for which it is suited. The predominating bias, the ruling passion, will be the determining cause of man's future destiny. If that be on the side of God, then to one of the many mansions which He has provided for His own will that soul be drawn at death. But it would be unreasonable to suppose that such mixed characters are on a level, are in the same moral condition, as more perfect characters. The prophet Amos speaks of those damaged but saved souls as "firebrands plucked out of the burning;" St. Paul, applying the same image, speaks of men who "shall be saved, yet so as through fire;" singed and scarred, but rescued. "Him that cometh to Me," says our Lord, "I will in no wise cast out." And by the parable of the returning prodigal He has taught us that, however low the sinner may have fallen, the everlasting arms are still beneath him, and the Almighty Father is ever ready to welcome him back the instant he turns his face homeward. The prodigal's father was on the watch for him, never forgot him; and therefore he saw him "when he was yet a great way off," just leaving the pig-sty, "and

had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck and kissed him." He did not wait for the sinner's arrival, did not walk leisurely with dignified steps to meet the returning prodigal halfway. He ran towards him the moment he saw the first faint quiverings of the better self reviving in that degraded form. And he meets the penitent with no reproaches. Penitence has blotted out the past as far as the Father is concerned, but not as regards the effect of sin on the prodigal himself. He is no longer on an equality with the son who went not astray. The latter is "ever with the father," in closer relationship to him, and all that the father has is his.

To put it briefly, then, we may say that no one will be finally lost whom Almighty love can save. If the door of hope be closed, it is by the sinner himself. So much we may safely say, and we have no warrant to say more. Jesus rebuked one who asked Him, "Lord, are there few that be saved?" by the practical answer, "Strive to enter in at the strait gate." It was not a matter for idle curiosity, for speculation about others, but for practical conduct; for each one to strive to make his own calling and election sure.

But let no one presume on God's never-failing readiness to forgive the returning sinner. The

question is not whether God will always forgive, but whether man can always repent. God's forgiveness is ever sure; man's repentance is never sure. Every act of sin weakens the will and lessens its power of resistance; and if the acts become habits, and the habits mould the character, the will may become completely paralyzed, and repentance may be impossible. That law seems to run through all created life: first, a period of weakness, pliability, indecision; then fixity, which refuses to change. The tree, while a sapling, may be trained to bend in any direction. But when it has reached maturity and taken its set, even the tempest, though it may break and uproot it, cannot alter its shape. So it is with human character. Its tendency is to grow from vacillation and instability to fixity. The greatest moral philosopher of antiquity, perhaps of all time, after a survey and analysis of human nature so profound and accurate that his treatise on ethics has become a text-book in Christian universities, came to the conclusion that perseverance in evil habits will eventually result in a character which he calls "incorrigible"—incapable of amendment; a will that has lost the power of refusing the evil and choosing the good, and therefore self-doomed to the hell of lost spirits—"seeking rest and finding none."

Oh, then, be wise, and resist sin in the beginning, for you can never tell whither the first step on the downward course may lead you, or whether you will be able to retrace your steps. It is not, let me repeat, a question of God's readiness to forgive, but of man's ability to repent. Once become captive to sin, and you may never be able to break its chains.

If you have followed me so far, you will see that Paradise, or the intermediate state, is the abode of all who die in the grace of God; but that their condition must necessarily vary indefinitely, from the brand plucked out of the burning to the purity and stability of mature sanctity; from the penitent prodigal to "the disciple whom Jesus loved." It follows that those diverse characters need diverse treatment; but they have all this note in common, that they are imperfect, more or less incomplete, and will remain so, in spite of general progress, till they are summoned to "inherit the kingdom prepared for them." So entirely did the Church of the first ages believe this, that in her liturgies and monumental inscriptions she prayed for peace, repose, light, refreshment, mercy for all the departed, including the highest saints and martyrs—even the Blessed Virgin, our Lord's mother.[1]

[1] See Appendix D.

In her belief, as attested by Liturgies, epitaphs, and other evidence, all souls remain in the intermediate state till the Second Advent. I cannot, however, conclude without some reference to two other points, one of which at least may suggest a difficulty to some minds.

If it be true that heaven is an abode of "many mansions," varying in splendour according to the spiritual elevation and capacity of their inhabitants, does it follow that there must needs be a separation, an absence of intercourse and intercommunion, between persons of different characters and endowments —that husbands and wives, parents and children, dear friends and neighbours, who have loved each other on earth, will be separated in heaven according to their differing degrees of sanctity and receptivity? It does not follow, and we may find illustrations of the fact even here. In this world persons may live side by side in close intercourse, and yet occupy, so to speak, different "mansions," and enjoy different scenes and sources of happiness. Place a man born blind alongside of one who sees, and there is no separation in one sense; but there is in another. The man who sees is in a world of which the blind man knows nothing—the world of form and colour; a beautiful world, but requiring eyes to see it. Let

the blind man be deaf in addition, and a second world is closed to him, touching him, embracing, penetrating him—the world of music—a world of exquisite beauty, but which does not exist for the deaf because they lack the sense of hearing. But, in addition to all this, photography and spectrum analysis have proved that there are worlds within worlds close to us now and here of which our gross senses can take no cognizance. Photography has shown that there are multitudes of stars beyond reach of the most powerful telescopes, and that the light of these stars is ever playing on our earth. So distant are they, and so attenuated are their rays, that it takes countless billions of these luminous vibrations to make an impression on the photographer's plate. "The waves beating from the Atlantic in long course of time," says one of our leading astronomers, "have gradually altered the face of the shore. But in one second of time there are as many minute waves of light beating in on one plate as the Atlantic has sent in during a million years—a whole geological period. The human eye is colour-blind to a vast proportion of the rays which come in from the stars. But the photo-plate sees all these invisible rays a great deal better than our eyes see the visible rays." It bewilders the intellect and

makes the imagination giddy to learn that within the petals of a flower, even within a speck of blood dissolved in a drop of water, the seven colours of the rainbow are seen as distinctly as in the bow which spans our sky. Yet that is one of the marvels which chemical analysis has revealed to us. Do not these things show how possible it may be for the inhabitants of heaven to occupy different spheres of being and enjoy the glories of different worlds—sounds and sights being audible and visible to some which are inaudible and invisible to others—and yet be all the while in close communion with each other? The material conditions under which we live here—let me say again—do not apply at all to the spiritual world. Loving hearts are not sundered in heaven any more than here because one may be purer and more richly endowed than the other, and therefore capable of receiving impressions to which the other is insensible. Just as the trained eye of the man of science can see a perfect rainbow in the lily or the rose—a world of beauty beyond the beauty seen by unskilled eyes—so different saints may see different worlds of splendour in the Beatific Vision, each receiving all that his spiritual condition can appreciate.

But what do we mean by the Beatific Vision?

Speaking generally, it means the highest vision of the Divine glory of which created intelligence is capable. St. Paul tells us that even in the intermediate state there are splendours too wonderful to find expression in any language of earth. How much more in heaven! Great names in theology believe that God the Father will never be seen by created eyes in His uncreated majesty and glory; and there are passages in the Bible which seem to bear that meaning. You remember the very striking incident related in Exodus xxxiii. 18, and following verses. Moses prayed God to allow him to see His glory—"I beseech Thee, show me Thy glory." But he was told that he had asked an impossible thing: "Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me, and live. And the Lord said, Behold, there is a place by Me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock: and it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a clift of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by: and I will take away mine hand, and thou shalt see my back parts: but my face shall not be seen." Only the afterglow of the Divine glory could be borne by human eyes. The unclouded vision of God would scorch and consume the beholder; and hence it is that it is an opinion among theologians that man will never see

the Divine glory as it is in itself in the bosom of the Father, but will only see it even in heaven as it is reflected in the Incarnate Son. Our Lord uses an expression in His prayer to the Father in the seventeenth chapter of St. John's Gospel, which seems to bear out this view: "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory, which Thou hast given me." St. Paul is still more clear and decided, for he says expressly, in the sixth chapter of 1 Timothy, that God "dwelleth in the unapproachable light, which no man hath seen nor can see." The expression is emphatic—literally, "whom not one of men (none of the human race) hath seen or can see." He puts no limit of time. Taking Holy Scripture for our guide, then, it seems that the Beatific Vision will consist in the closest view of Divine glory which man can bear, as it is seen reflected in the Incarnate Son — "the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," as St. Paul puts it. There will be degrees of happiness, some seeing more, some less; the saints differing from each other as one star differs from another star in glory. All will be as happy as their several natures will permit. All will be full, but not equally full—like vessels dropped into a well, each coming up full, but not equally full, and each

expanding more and receiving more according to the capacity of each; "going on from strength to strength" in an endless journey into fresh worlds of greater splendour and increased happiness.

These surely are suitable thoughts on the last evening of the year. We are too much tempted to regard this world as if it were the real world, and the world to come as if it were unreal, shadowy, vague, unsubstantial, distant, somewhere beyond the fixed stars. But, in matter of fact, it is this world which is unreal, phenomenal, unstable, never continuing in one stay. And how short our tenure of it is! Even if it were eternal, we are not eternally in it. We cannot tell how soon we may be summoned out of it; but we know the longest life has but a short time to remain here. On the other hand, the next world is eternal, stable, not distant, not beyond the stars—embraces this world, penetrates it through and through, is quite close to us, holding our treasures—those who are lost and gone from us, and whom we may hope to meet again, and even now are near us, though we have no organs to see and hear them. Let us take that thought home with us. How reverent it ought to make us, how careful, how cautious! Let us remember, then, on the eve of the New Year on which we are entering, that this world is not our

home; that we are but travellers passing through it, and that its only importance, its only value to us, is that it is a school, a training place, "a clift of the rock," in which, like Moses on the Mount, we may prepare ourselves to meet our God

IX.

THE HIDDEN TREASURE.

"*Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.*"—MATT. vi. 19-21.

IT is impossible, I think, to read these words, and others like them which are scattered up and down the New Testament, without being struck with the contrast which they suggest between the Christianity there portrayed and the Christianity which we see in action around us. "If any man smite thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also." "If any man constrain thee to go with him a mile, go with him twain." "If any man will take thy cloak, forbid him not to take thy coat also." "If thou wouldst be perfect, sell all that thou hast and give to the poor." And then the words of the text—"Lay not up for

yourselves treasures upon earth." This teaching seems to condemn absolutely the vindication of ourselves against personal wrong; war under any circumstances; private property, and the accumulation of wealth. And we must remember that our Lord and His Apostles practised what they preached. He went about, a houseless wanderer, through the towns and villages of Judæa, and said of Himself that, though "the foxes had holes, and the birds of the air had nests," He, the Son of Man, "had not where to lay His head." And so also the Apostles and early preachers of Christianity. They had no settled home. They went about doing good and seeking no reward; having no private property as a rule, and depending for a livelihood on the charity of their converts, who were generally poor. Are we to conclude then that the present political and social and industrial systems of Christendom are altogether wrong, opposed alike to the letter and spirit of the Gospel, since they appear to stand in such violent contrast to the quotations which I have made from Christ's own teaching? Are we obliged to believe that, after all, the excellent people who call themselves the Society of Friends are right when they declare war unrighteous, no matter what the cause? And must we admit that Communism is in truth the true doctrine of the

Gospel? It would surely be hard to say so against the universal practice of Christendom. It would be like saying that the Church throughout the world has apostatized from the Gospel, and that the gates of hell, contrary to our Lord's promise, have prevailed against her. How then are we to explain the contrast between the teaching of the Gospel and the practice of Christendom?

It may be explained, I think, as follows:—The method, the true method, of all great reformers is to lay down broad principles which strike at the roots of the evil which they seek to cure, leaving time and circumstances to supply the necessary qualifications. For the object of the reformer is to carry the multitude with him by planting in their hearts and imaginations a few fundamental truths which they can understand and remember. If he were to stop to explain the limits, modifications, and exceptions which would be necessary in varying circumstances, the result would be that the great truths would be lost in the multitude of details, and he would make no progress at all. It is for this reason that great reformers are commonly regarded as revolutionists by their own generation, because they propound truths that require time, perhaps a long time, for the full understanding of them. Our Lord Himself was

denounced by the educated class of His day as an anarchist who was stirring up the people, and His disciples were characterized as men who were turning the world upside down. In this way, then, Christianity has laid down a few broad and deep principles which are applicable to all races, ranks, and conditions of mankind—in contradistinction in this respect to all other religions which the world has known, and especially to the religion of Mohammed, which consists not so much of principles as of a complicated system of minute rules. The consequence is that, while all other religions are tribal or national, confined to certain races or localities, Christianity is a universal religion, adapted to all times, and races, and climes. Christianity, as I have said, laid down such doctrines as were bound in the long run to undermine the foundations of Pagan institutions, in so far as these were opposed to Divine law. But neither our Lord nor His Apostles declared war against any of the institutions, even the evil institutions, of the time. They were very careful not to upset existing governments and institutions until Christianity was ready to supply their place. Thus our Lord did not condemn even the institution of slavery; nor did His Apostles. On the contrary, they exhorted slaves to be obedient to their masters,

remembering always that their true Master was in heaven, and they were therefore to serve, not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but as the servants of their Heavenly Father. The masters, on the other hand, were to bear in mind that they too had a Master over them, who would one day demand a strict account of their conduct towards their slaves. You will remember that St. Paul went even so far as to send back a runaway slave to his Christian master, though in doing so he wrote that exquisite specimen of tact and politeness—the Epistle to Philemon—in which he expresses a hope that the master will now receive Onesimus, who had meanwhile become a Christian, no longer as a slave, but as a brother.

But while admitting all this, we must remember always that the law laid down in the text is the true law; that you have there the essence of Christianity laid bare. In heaven there is no resentment against injury, for in heaven no one does wrong. In heaven there is no personal or private property; nobody has anything that he can call his own, for no one ever thinks of himself; all are engaged in unselfish service. And it was the life of heaven that our Lord constantly placed before His followers as the ideal at which they were to aim. "Be ye perfect," He said, "as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Not of

course that such perfection was possible to fallible and feeble human nature, but that unless men strove after the unattainable, unless they sought idea perfection—a goal retreating as they advanced—they would never reach excellence in their spiritual calling And so here in the text He lays down the broad principle that we must not lay up our treasures on this earth; that we must always strive, in the spirit of the text, to sit loosely to the things of this world, and live a life of detachment as regards the things of earth and time.

So much, then, as to the general aspect of the words of the text. But what is the precise meaning of the words? Of course you all understand their meaning in a general way. The difficulty lies, if there be a difficulty, in the reason which our Lord gives for His command. For you will observe that He not only bids men not to lay up their treasures upon earth; He goes on to give as a reason: "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." What does He mean? The common interpretation, I suppose, is something of this sort. It would be foolish to lay up our treasures on earth because, if we do, we must one day lose them. Either riches will make to themselves wings, as the wise man says, and fly, or we must certainly part from them and

pass into that unseen land where the only book is the book of doom, and the only property the Paradise of the just. All that is true; but you will observe that the reason which our Lord gives why men ought not to lay up for themselves treasures upon earth is not that a day will come when they must be separated from their treasure. He says, on the contrary, that men must not lay up their treasures here because they cannot be separated from their treasure. Now that sounds strange. Let us see if we cannot get at His meaning. "Don't lay up your treasures upon earth, for you can never part from them." That would seem, at first sight, a very good reason for laying them up on earth; but only at first sight. Think it over, and it comes to this: by the constitution of your nature your heart cannot be sundered from its treasure. It is a law which lies at the roots of your being that wherever the treasure is, there also must be the heart that owns it. And it follows that the fortune of the one must be the fortune of the other. And we are always laying up treasure somewhere. We cannot help it. We must seek our happiness outside of ourselves. That also is a law of our nature which we do not sufficiently realize. One of our temptations, of the young and vigorous and active in particular, is to imagine that

the real secret of happiness lies in being independent, in having our own way, in being under no restraint. But that is a great and fatal fallacy. There is just one and only one Being in the whole universe who is and can afford to be independent — Almighty God Himself. He is absolutely independent. He depends on nothing external to Himself. He is the centre and circumference of His own happiness. There was a time when there was nothing but the Triune God, nothing external to Himself; no sun, or moon, or stars; no earth, or sea, or sky; no angels to minister around His throne; nothing to fill the awful void of infinite space but Almighty God Himself. And He was absolutely happy in His solitude. He needs nothing from without, and therefore, when He broke the silence of eternity with the sights and sounds of created and finite life, it was not because He needed anything from without to supplement His own happiness, but because His nature, like His name, is love, and it is of the essence of love to desire to make others partakers of its own blessedness. And so God created a world of sentient and intelligent creatures to make them partakers of His own uncreated happiness.

But with created natures it is altogether different. Their happiness comes to them from without, and

their hearts are always throwing out creepers and weaving tendrils around some object external to themselves. And, therefore, when God created man He said it was not good for man to be alone, he must have some one to share his happiness, some finite being like himself who could hold equal communion with him. Thus you see our happiness lies in having treasures external to ourselves, and the heart can never be separated from its treasures; wherever the treasure is, there of necessity must the heart be also. But Jesus goes on to tell us that there are two treasure-houses where we can lay up our treasures, each with characteristics of its own. One is upon earth, and that is a treasure-house which is exposed to various accidents. It is transitory; it never continueth in one stay; we cannot rest in it as in an enduring home. And then our treasure, while we lay it up there, is liable to all kinds of evils. Thieves break into the treasure-house and carry off the treasure. Moths creep into it and eat into the very heart of the treasure, leaving nothing but an empty husk. The very air is charged with mischief, so that the treasure, even if it escape all other ravages, is corroded by rust and destroyed.

And so it follows, since it is a law of our nature that the heart should be united with its treasure, that if

we lay up our treasure here, not only will the treasure itself be exposed to these evils, but the heart, which is necessarily inseparable from its treasure, must be exposed to them also. It, too, will be corroded by the rust; it, too, will be eaten to its core by the moth; it, too, will be stolen piecemeal by the thief. And therefore if we lay up our treasure here we shall lose it certainly, but we shall lose it because both the treasure and the heart, which is inseparable from it, will perish together. We have a solemn illustration in the gospel for the fourth Sunday after Epiphany, which has been read in this morning's service,[1] of what happens to those who foolishly thus lay up perishable treasures. We have the awful story of the lost spirits, who, when our Lord approached them, cried out in pain, because the near proximity to them of their God, whom they knew and recognized, was the very greatest torment. They prayed Him not to drive them out of the wretched man whom they possessed, or, if He did, to allow them to enter into the unclean swine. Why? Because the greatest torment, the greatest hell, for a lost spirit is to be left absolutely to himself. That is a void which the lost cannot endure. The most intolerable presence to them is their own ruined selves; and in order to

[1] Twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity, 1893.

escape from themselves, from their terrible emptiness, their devouring and unappeasable passions, their frightful loneliness—for there is no loneliness like that of absolute selfishness—they take possession, if possible, of some sentient or intelligent beings other than themselves. They try to possess human beings, beings with reasonable intelligence, made in the image of Almighty God—as they, too, were originally made—in order to forget their own woe, the haunting doom of seeking rest and finding none. Therefore, rather than be alone, they prayed to be allowed to enter into the unclean bodies of the swine. What an image of the awful and terrible doom that is awaiting those who are laying up treasures upon earth, thinking of themselves and their own selfish happiness alone; losing life—the Divine life—whilst seeking to save the perishable life. But, for our comfort, our Lord tells us there is another treasure-house in which, if we lay up our treasure, we shall find it again safe and secure. If we lay up our treasure in heaven, it will be safe from the ravages of moth and rust and thief. And inasmuch as the heart is inseparable from its treasure, not only shall we meet our treasure again, but we shall find ourselves secure as the treasure is secure.

This is a very solemn, a very important truth,

because we are constantly, day by day, hour by hour, laying up treasure in either of those two treasure-houses. In other words, we are constantly attaching ourselves to some object of affection. No man can stand still in the race of life. For man is a creature of progress; he is always on the move towards heaven or hell. We must have some object of affection. And we grow into the likeness of what we love. If our treasure be pure and noble, our hearts too will become pure and noble. If our treasure be mean and base, so will our hearts be also Day by day we grow up towards the full stature of Christian perfection, or go back under the dominion of the lower nature which we share with the brutes that perish.

And this leads us to another thought—a very awful thought. Not only have we thus our own eternal destiny in our own keeping; we are responsible in our measure and degree for the eternal destiny of such souls as come within the sphere of our influence. And just as we may be ignorant of the effect of our conduct upon our own character, so we may, unknowingly, effect the ruin of others. Men and women go on for years laying up treasures upon earth without a suspicion of the mischief that is going on within them. You may have read of the subsidence of earth, involving houses, with their inhabitants, in ruin. So

silent and sudden was the sinking of the ground that there was no time to escape. But, sudden as was the catastrophe, the cause was gradual. Water had been filtering through the soil, or some other disturbing agent had been at work, perhaps for years, undermining the ground; yet the surface gave no sign till the crash came. Or you have heard or read of a man falling down dead. A quick run to catch a train, or an unexpected piece of news, has been too much for him; and the explanation is that he had heart-disease. For years mischief had been going on within him, and he knew it not. To himself and to others he seemed strong and healthy, and all went well till the unwonted strain came, and then the heart was not equal to the demand made upon it, and the man died suddenly. So it is with the ruin of many a seemingly fine character. The process of dissolution had been going on steadily for years, and the man did not know it, because he had not been tried. He bore a high character, and honestly believed that he deserved it. And then, one day, a great temptation assailed him suddenly, and he gave way, and he found himself standing in a criminal's dock, to the astonishment of all who knew him—to his own, perhaps, most of all. And the explanation is that he had been for years laying up his treasures upon earth, and the moth had been at

work all the while upon the heart, which was bound up with the treasure, and the thief had been stealing it piecemeal, and the rust had been falling upon it—in showers, perhaps, as fine as the down upon the butterfly's wing, but without intermission. So that when the strain of an unforeseen temptation came there was no strength to resist it; the character having been invisibly and silently eaten into and corroded, it yielded easily to the pressure, and the man fell down morally dead.

And just as we may ruin our own characters without knowing it, so we may ruin the characters of others. We are always influencing each other—a truth which I have often impressed upon you, because I feel its deep importance. We cannot help ourselves. And this influence, which we thus unconsciously exercise by our mere presence, by look, gesture, expression of face, is probably all the more potent for being unconscious. There are germs of moral health or disease continually passing from us and infecting for good or ill those about us. We read that when our Lord was on earth virtue went out of Him sometimes, and healed the bodies of those who came in contact with it. His Divine humanity was always diffusing a spiritual atmosphere of purity around Him, which attracted, they knew not how, those who came

within the sphere of His influence. So it must be with us in so far as our characters are pure and unselfish and Christlike. Our very presence will influence for good all who are near us, making them purer and nobler and more unselfish, and shaming what is mean and base out of them. If, on the other hand, our characters are ignoble and impure, we shall exude, without knowing or intending it, a poisonous influence on all who come near us. Have we not sometimes felt this mysterious influence—a presence attracting, perhaps awing, us by some sort of spiritual magnetism; or, on the other hand, repelling us as by the presage of impending danger? Let us endeavour to keep this inalienable responsibility of ours always in our thoughts. And it will be a great help to test ourselves now and then by the example of our Divine Master. He went about doing good to others, and never thinking of Himself. Consider what we read about Him in the chapter from which the gospel of to-day is taken. He spent the whole day preaching, healing the sick, and answering questions put to Him by persons in moral difficulties; and when the evening was closing in, and an increasing crowd was pressing on Him by the side of the lake, He ordered the disciples to cross over to the other side, His exhausted nature being no longer able to bear the strain. They

took Him into the boat, the narrative says, "just as He was," without a pause for rest and refreshment. And they laid Him down in the stern with His head on a pillow. His tired humanity could bear the fatigue no longer, and He fell into a sleep so profound that neither the roar of the tempest, which came down suddenly on the lake, nor the breaking of the waves over the boat, was able to awake Him. What a picture of His toil for us and for our salvation! It was but one incident in the life of self-sacrifice which He led on earth. He came to fulfil a mission, and He had His mission ever before His mind—on sea-shore or mountain-side, in crowded city, or secluded village, or in desert place. We, too, have each a mission, and our business here is to fulfil it; not to lay up treasures upon earth, but to lay them up in heaven. And, after all, how foolish to lay up one's treasures upon earth, if we only think of it. We pride ourselves on our possession of reason and judgment. But what does our reason tell us? Does it not assure us that, on the most favourable view of the matter, we can lay our finger upon a definite point of time in the future, and in the very near future, when we must pass away from this world, and our treasures, whether of gold or its value, or the more precious treasures of surviving friendships, must be left behind;

and we must go naked, as we came, into the silent realm from which there is no returning? We know that our home is beyond the grave; yet how slow we are to act on our knowledge; how prone to act, and think, and live as if we had an eternity to look forward to on earth, instead of being but a band of pilgrims passing through a foreign land to an everlasting home; a home not like this earthly life, subject to change and disappointment, but stable and unfading; where the worm never gnaws at the root of the rose, where the yellowness of decay never comes upon the woods, and no thief prowls to steal nor rust falls to tarnish and destroy the treasure which is laid up there.

X.

PURITY OF HEART THE CONDITION OF SEEING GOD.[1]

"*Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.*"—MATT. v. 8.

IF it is natural to expect that that will prove the highest blessing which is joined by our Saviour with the highest grace, we may be sure that man can possess no nobler endowment than that purity of heart which is to be rewarded with the sight of God. For Holy Scripture does not furnish any loftier description of the happiness of eternity than that it shall be spent before the throne of God, in Whose presence is fulness of joy, and at Whose right hand there are pleasures for evermore. If our evils on earth are like those of exiles who are suffering exclusion from the joys of home, our restoration to the

[1] Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday evening, August 17, 1890.

lost blessedness of Paradise must consist in re-admission to free Communion, a nearer than that which Adam lost, with our once grieved, but now reconciled, Father and Lord. As men rejoice when the shadow of an eclipse has passed by, that they can again behold the glad light of the sun, or as prisoners just rescued from a dungeon exult in the freedom with which they can now breathe again the freshness of the winds of heaven, so will the soul of man recover an exalted gladness, of which the highest earthly delight is but a weak representation, when the present limitations of our spiritual sight are removed, when the mysteries which sin has woven have all rent away, and when, amidst the hosts of bright and unfallen spirits, we are raised to see God face to face.

Such is the unspeakable reward which is promised to the pure in heart. In the text this is stated simply as the decree of God's will. He has promised: who can hesitate to believe that visions beyond all earthly glory, happiness beyond all human thought, shall be the privilege of the pure in heart when they are admitted to see "the King in His beauty," to behold "the land that is very far off"? But what I now particularly wish to urge is, that there is another side to this great promise, which rests it, not only

on the decree of God's will, but even more on those laws of immutable necessity which are the foundation of all excellence and truth throughout the universe. With these, indeed, God's will is in most perfect and most permanent harmony: yet they are represented as separable, at least in thought; so that we speak of two distinguishable principles when we say that the law of holiness necessitates, and that the will of God ordains. If then, on the one hand, it is God's promise that the pure in heart shall be admitted to His presence, and if it is implied in that promise that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord," we know also, on the other hand, that this decree of God's will rests on that everlasting law of right, which ordains that the unholy cannot enter heaven; that even Mercy itself could not command their entrance without contradiction of that fundamental morality, on which the holiness of duty reposes with a harmony which cannot be disturbed. That is a truth of which we have all need to remind ourselves, because we are apt to deceive ourselves in this matter. When we have yielded to temptation, we sometimes comfort ourselves with the reflection that God is love, and that when the worst comes to the worst He will find some way of admitting us into heaven. Now what I am anxious to impress upon you is, that entrance

into heaven is not an impossibility only, but would if possible, be no boon to any who are not heavenly-minded.

First, then, admission into heaven is impossible except to the heavenly-minded. The promise that the pure in heart shall see God implies that the impure cannot see Him. A little reflection will enable you to see how this is. The two attributes by which God is especially distinguished in the Bible are light and love. "God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all." He "dwelleth in the light that no man can approach unto." Our Lord calls Himself "the Light of the world," and His loyal followers He calls "the children of light," in contradistinction to "the children of this world." And St. Paul insists on the necessity of our being made "meet for the inheritance of the saints in light." I need not multiply instances: your memory will recall many more in the Old Testament and in the New.

Now light is necessary not merely to the enjoyment of life, but to its well-being. To vegetable life it is an absolute necessity; and if it is not absolutely essential to the existence of the higher orders of animals, it is certainly essential to their healthy existence. But existence without enjoyment would be a poor thing, hardly deserving the name of life.

Consider what this world would be to us if it were suddenly to be veiled in total darkness: no sun by day, no moon or stars by night; not a gleam of light, natural or artificial, to penetrate the gloom. It would not merely mean the absence of all that now delights the eye, through form and colour, light and shade, though that would be an inconceivable loss; there would, in addition, be absolute helplessness, entire cessation of work, travel, movement, on sea and land. All vegetable life would perish, and all animal life, man included, would speedily follow. Total darkness would mean universal death. And, besides all this, there is something horrible in mere darkness, even apart from its consequences; it affects the imagination with a weird mysterious terror, as of dangers from which there is no escape. Those born blind in a world of light do not feel this—at least, to the same extent: partly, no doubt, because, having never seen light, they have no experience of what darkness is; but also because even the blind derive solace and enjoyment from the light which bathes and penetrates their bodies, though they do not see it, and which enables friends to minister to them. But to be plunged suddenly from light into universal and unending darkness would be terrible. We have some faint illustrations of this in the

contemporaneous descriptions of the darkness that shrouded the Bay of Naples in the eruption of Vesuvius which destroyed Pompeii and Herculaneum. But perhaps the most vivid description ever given of the horrors of total darkness as it affects the imagination, when spread over a whole people, is that which we find in the Book of Wisdom.[1] What could be finer than the following?—

"They died for fear, denying that they saw the air, which could of no side be avoided. For wickedness, condemned by her own witness, is very timorous, and being pressed with conscience, always forecasteth grievous things. For fear is nothing else but a betraying of the succours which reason offereth. And the expectation from within, being less, counteth the ignorance more than the cause which bringeth the torment. But they, sleeping the same sleep that night, which was indeed intolerable, and which came upon them out of the bottoms of inevitable hell, were partly vexed with monstrous apparitions, and partly fainted, their heart failing them. For a sudden fear, and not looked for, came upon them. So then whosoever there fell down was straitly kept, shut up in a prison without iron bars. For whether he were husbandman, or shepherd, or a labourer in the field, he was overtaken, and endured that necessity, which could not be avoided: for they were all bound with one chain of darkness. Whether it were a whistling wind, or a melodious noise of birds among the spreading branches, or a pleasing fall of water running violently, or a hideous sound of stones cast down, or a running that could not be

[1] xvii. 10-21.

seen of skipping beasts, or a roaring voice of most savage wild beasts, or a rebounding echo from the hollow mountains: these things made them to swoon for fear. For the whole world shined with clear light, and none were hindered in their labour: over them only was an heavy night, an image of that darkness which should afterward receive them; but yet were they unto themselves more grievous than the darkness."

Now our Lord warns us more than once that the absence of moral purity means, in the spiritual world, a sphere of darkness. Those who depart out of this life with characters unfit for heaven are of necessity in darkness, a gloom more or less dense, according to the condition of their spiritual senses. It follows therefore that an unholy person, one whose character had been moulded on the principle of selfishness, could never enter heaven; because, even if he were admitted into that abode of bliss, it would not exist for him: he would see nothing, hear nothing, feel nothing outside of himself. He might be bathed in the unearthly glory of the Beatific Vision; the air around him might vibrate with celestial harmonies: but he would find himself in a dark and dreary void, seeing nothing, hearing nothing, because he had allowed those spiritual senses, which we have here in germ, to perish for lack of use; just as a man shut up for years in a dark dungeon will in time lose the use of his eyes.

Does this seem strange to any of you? If so, let me remind you that we have experiences of the same kind in this world. Take the case of a man born deaf and blind. Do you not see that he would be at once in the midst of two worlds, yet know as little of either as we now know of that world which eye of mortal man "hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor heart conceived"? The splendour of the dawn; the pensive beauty of sunset; the gracefulness of waving forests; the glory, more than Solomon's, of the flowers of the field; the picturesque forms of mountains; the mystery of the ocean; the soul-subduing awfulness of infinite space melting away from your sight through the countless worlds which sparkle like gems in a star-lit sky;—all these things are to the blind man as if they were not, because he has no eyes to see them. And so, too, as regards the world of sound. It is close to the deaf man. Its waves pass over him, but he heeds them not. For he lacks the organ of hearing. But open the eyes and ears of the blind and deaf, and you admit them at once, without change of abode, into a new world of unimagined beauty, which was close to them all the while, though they knew it not. But suppose that, in addition to being blind and deaf, a man lacks the sense of touch. Without eyes, or ears, or nerves of

sensation, such a man would be in this world, and yet not know it. His soul would be imprisoned in a body which debarred contact with God's beautiful creation. Darkness impenetrable, silence unbroken, isolation the most absolute, would be the lot of such a man as I have imagined. He could see nothing, hear nothing, touch nothing, not because there was nothing, but because he lacked the organs necessary for communication with the outer world.[1]

Now we are here in training for the spiritual world. At present we are deaf and blind to its realities. Yet it is not far away beyond the planetary spaces and the fixed stars. It is close to us. It encloses and interpenetrates this visible world. Shapes move to and fro about us, and voices agitate the air, though they make no impression on our dull organs. How little does the caterpillar know of the powers which lie hidden within it, or of the world in whose sunshine it will one day flit joyously from flower to flower! Yet the butterfly is not a different creature from the caterpillar: it is but the caterpillar transformed. Nor is the world of the butterfly different from the world of the caterpillar: it is the same world, seen with other eyes. The change is in the caterpillar, not in the world.

[1] See Appendix E.

Like the caterpillar, we are here in training for a higher life; possessing in germ the faculties which, properly developed, will fit us for the life beyond the grave. But if we pass out of this life with our spiritual faculties undeveloped, if we have not cultivated that "purity of heart" which alone can enable us to see God, then we shall never see heaven; we shall remain in what our Lord significantly calls "the outer darkness"—darkness which is not due to the absence of light, but comes of blind eyes. Death, as God intended it, is the rising of the soul, not through the regions of space, but in its mode of existence. It is the passage from a lower form of life to a higher. And the lost are they who have destroyed the powers which, duly exercised in the lower life, would in time have fitted them for the higher.

"Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." To see God, then, must be the highest form of bliss; and it is so, among other reasons, because those who enjoy that vision are thereby placed behind the framework of nature, and are thus enabled to see things in their causes as well as in their effects For instance, the heart of man yearns for what is beautiful. Men will travel long distances, endure hardships, spend money freely, that they may fill their souls with beauty in one or other of its manifold

forms. They will give high prices for works of art, not because they find them useful, but for the sake of their beauty. Then think of the beauty of music: so evanescent, yet so enthralling; melting into nothing as you listen to it, but leaving behind it a crowd of delightful and soothing impressions and vague mysterious longings. Consider the multitude of artists who have for ages been copying the beauties of nature, and always finding some fresh beauty to copy. Think of the infinite, inexhaustible combinations of musical sounds which are still mute in the air around you, waiting for the touch of some great composer to give them utterance. It all comes from Him whom the pure in heart shall one day see face to face. To see God, then, is to be at the source of all that is beautiful in the universe.

And as man's love of beauty is insatiable, so is his love of knowledge. It is one of the marks which distinguish him from the brutes. They neither reflect on the past nor trouble themselves about the future. They live under a law of mechanical necessity, following blind impulses without knowing why, and desiring no knowledge beyond the requirements of their bodily needs. But man cannot rest satisfied in brute ignorance; he seeks to trace effects to their causes, and will not willingly remain ignorant of whatever it is

possible for him to know. Men will endure hardships, and even risk their lives, to discover the source of a river in the wilds of Africa, or a channel in the Arctic Seas; not for gain, not even for fame, but from sheer unwillingness to be baffled in the quest of knowledge. But to see God is to be at the source of all knowledge, and to have our thirst for knowledge satisfied to the full measure of our capacity.

Another feeling which is rooted in our nature is a passion for justice. The passion may be blunted and perverted, but it is part of man's original endowment. And it finds no adequate satisfaction here. We see innocence oppressed, virtue outraged, the prophets of righteousness persecuted, the wicked flourishing "like a green bay tree," and God apparently unregardful. To see God is to understand why evil exists, and is allowed to prevail in a world ruled, as we believe, by infinite wisdom, power, and love.

But it is not hereafter only that the pure in heart shall see God. They shall see Him now in this present life: in the operations of nature; in the succession of the seasons; in the wonders of the animal kingdom; and, above all, in human nature, made originally in His own image, and now redeemed and united for ever with the Godhead through the Incarnation of the Divine Son. See how the Psalmist

saw God in all the energy and all the life of the visible creation: in thunder and in lightning; in the tempest that "breaketh the cedars of Libanus;" in wandering clouds; in "the streams that run among the hills;" in "the lions roaring after their prey," that "seek their meat from God;" in "the young ravens that call upon Him;" and in the strength and skill which enabled David to overcome his enemies. And a greater than David has taught the same lesson from the flowers, which God clothes with beauty; and the sparrows, which cannot "fall to the ground" without the providential care of the Almighty Father.

But it is in human nature especially that we are to see the highest manifestation of God in this world. The Apostle speaks of Christians as "temples of the Holy Ghost," shrines of a Divine Presence. The pure in heart see God in every form of humanity. And it is because people are not pure in heart that they sometimes commit outrages on human nature—their own or another's. Who would dare defile his own body, or tempt another to sin, if he could see God in that human form? Yet He is there, and the pure in heart behold Him. If it is an offence against the law of the land to deface the image of the sovereign on one of the coins of the realm, how much more

heinous an offence is it, think you, to deface the image of God in any of the souls whom He has made in His own likeness? Let that thought be with you whenever you are tempted to sin—the thought that comforted Hagar in the solitude of the wilderness, when she thought she was alone, and found that God was there also, though she knew it not. "And she called the name of the Lord that spake unto her, Thou art a God that seeth: for she said, Have I even here looked after Him that seeth me?"[1]

"Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Last week there passed into the world unseen a great Englishman, to whom these words were an intense reality—John Henry Newman. From his childhood upwards, as he has told us in his "Apologia," this world of phenomena was to him but a screen, concealing, yet also partially revealing, an eternal world of unimaginable splendour, full of life and movement, with spiritual beings passing to and fro in ministries of love. The world which we behold was to him—it is his own simile—like the snow which covers the earth in winter, and discloses, as it melts away in spring, the world of verdure and of flowers that lay all the while hidden beneath it. To him the spiritual world was the real world, while

[1] Gen. xvi. 13.

the things of sense and time had virtue only in the degree in which they were related to the things eternal. His soul, like the Psalmist's, was "athirst for God," whom he served zealously through all changes of opinion and phases of belief. "Whosoever," says our Lord, "has the will to do God's will shall know the doctrine whether it be of God." Newman had the willing mind, and although we may regret that his faith in our Church failed him in the stress of persecution, we cannot doubt that he has earned the benediction of the pure in heart. And, now that he is gone, we feel that he belongs, not so much to this or that communion, as to the whole of Christendom. His life was equally divided between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, but men of all communions now unite to honour his memory. It has been suggested that his body should be laid in Westminster Abbey; but what matters it where the bodies of the illustrious dead repose? It was a custom in ancient Athens to bury at the public cost those who fell in battle for their country. They were reverently exposed for three days before burial, and were then laid in coffins made of cypress wood, and conveyed in cars to the place of sepulture "in the fairest suburb of the city." The most striking feature of the pageant, however, was an empty

bier in honour of those whose bodies could not be found. It was felt that it mattered little where the bodies of the brave were laid. "For of illustrious men the whole earth is the sepulchre; and not only does the inscription upon columns in their own land point it out, but in foreign lands also there dwells with every one an unwritten memorial graven on the heart rather than on a material monument."[1] And may we not say of men like John Henry Newman that the whole earth is their sepulchre? No national monument is needed to perpetuate their fame; they live and energize in their works and their example, and, being dead, still speak—perhaps more persuasively than when they were with us in the flesh. Cardinal Newman outlived the suspicion and obloquy that once made him unpopular, and the world, which said so many hard things of him, did him justice long before he died. Last time I saw him was within these sacred walls. As most of you know, he was passionately fond of music, and he asked me to take him quietly into the cathedral, and place him behind the congregation, for the service had begun. "I am so fond of the chanting in the English Church," he said, "and I have not heard it for a long time." And now he is gone to join those who "sing the

[1] See Pericles' splendid funeral oration in Thucydides, bk. ii. c. 13.

song of Moses and the Lamb." And we, even the youngest of us, must soon follow him into that land whence there is no returning. Cultivate, then, while you still have time, that purity of heart which is so attractive here on earth, and without which your eyes will never "see the King in His beauty," or "look upon the land that is very far off."

XI.

MYSTERY A MARK OF GOD'S WORK.[1]

"*Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.*"—MATT. v. 8.

ONE of the characteristic features of this world in which we live is the mystery which pervades it all. There is mystery everywhere—above, below, around, in sky, on land and sea—something that in the last analysis eludes the utmost skill of human science. Examples strew the path of the inquirer. On the threshold he meets the mystery of the origin of life. Spontaneous generation is a discredited doctrine among the leading teachers of physical science. Whence then came the first germ of life? It is a mystery which science has not been able to solve. Man can make, unmake, and remake a crystal; he can never rekindle the vital spark that has been quenched in any of the myriad forms of organic life. But in addition to those

[1] Preached in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, Christmas Day, 1886.

innumerable mysteries which baffle human reason, there is another class of mysteries which reveal themselves—some to trained, others to special faculties. In the forms of mountains and the formation of rocks the uneducated mind sees nothing more than meets the eye; on the same rocks and hills the geologist reads the complex history of extinct worlds. But Nature has secrets which scientific knowledge alone can never unlock. Special faculties are needed. The artist sees visions which the merely scientific man cannot behold, and he gives them enduring form in marble or on canvas. The poet sees other visions still, and clothes them in immortal language. Multitudes of human beings watched the agony of dying gladiators in the arena, and made of it a Roman holiday. The pathos of the scene one day appealed to the pity of an artist, and he embodied it in imperishable marble. Centuries afterwards a great poet gazed upon that dumb yet speaking marble, and he saw in the dying eyes something which the artist probably had not thought of—a longing to see once more a distant home far away by the shining Danube.

We have thus in this world which we inhabit a series of mysteries enfolded one within the other, which require partly trained and partly special faculties to apprehend them. Indeed, we may say that

mystery is one of the marks of God's works alike in the kingdom of nature and of grace. How could it be otherwise when you consider who God is, and who we are? He is infinite and eternal; "having neither beginning of days nor end of life." "For My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways My ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts." It stands to reason therefore that any revelation of God to man must have some mystery in it—something that baffles all our searching. How often are we constrained to say with Job: "Behold, I go forward, but He is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive Him; on the left hand, where He doth work, but I cannot behold Him: He hideth Himself on the right hand that I cannot see Him." "Verily Thou art a God that hidest Thyself," says the prophet.

But it is not of the mystery which is inseparable from our dealings with such a Being as God that I am going to speak to you this morning, but of the mystery in which it has pleased God to shroud—unnecessarily, as we might carelessly be tempted to think—the various revelations which He has made of Himself to man. Human life begins in mystery: I do not mean the mystery of its origin, but the mystery

of the moral discipline which was imposed on our first parents. They were forbidden to eat of a certain fruit, on pain of learning prematurely the knowledge of good and evil, and thereby ruining their nature. They disobeyed, and by that seemingly trivial act brought disaster on themselves and on their yet unborn race. Then God called Abraham away from his home and kindred to a strange land, in which "He gave him none inheritance—no, not so much as to set his foot on: yet He promised that He would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child."[1] And when the child of promise is born "out of due time," his father is commanded to slay him, and obeys. When the time draws near for the fulfilment of the promise, Moses is sent to deliver the Israelites from the bondage of Egypt. And God reveals His presence in a mystery: a bush on fire, yet not consumed; and a voice bidding Moses to reverence the ground on which he stood, as it was the penumbra of the Divine Presence. He is then commanded to go and tell the Israelites, working as slaves under hard taskmasters in Egypt, that the God of their fathers, by name "I Am," had sent him to deliver them. A mysterious name still, and necessarily so; but more mysterious

[1] Acts vii. 5.

when proclaimed to the enslaved race who groaned under the lash of Pharaoh's taskmasters. And yet it was just the mystery of the name that was calculated to rouse curiosity and stimulate inquiry. It would lead a thoughtful Israelite to see that the God who called Himself "I Am" was a being very different from the gods of Egypt—birds and quadrupeds, which could not save themselves from death. But the name announced by Moses—the "I Am," who was "the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob"—was evidently self-existent and beyond the reach of death. And when the moral law was proclaimed from Horeb, the revelation was enshrouded in mystery—thick darkness, with the roar of thunder and the play of lightning: the law itself so simple that a child could understand it, but issuing out of impenetrable mystery.

And when at last "the Desire of all nations" came, we find the same note of mystery heralding and attending His advent. I pass by for the present the mystery of His birth, and call your attention rather to the circumstances which were so well calculated to mislead the Jews concerning Him. He was so different from the glowing pictures which the prophets drew of the Messiah. And then His flight from Bethlehem in infancy, His sojourn in Egypt, and His home in Galilee, almost inevitably led the Jews of His time astray

about Him. Nor would He satisfy their apparently not unreasonable doubts when they asked for a sign of His Messiahship. "Then came the Jews round about Him and said unto Him, How long dost Thou hold us in doubt? If Thou be the Christ, tell us plainly." But He refused. And when He rose from the dead He abstained from giving what might seem to us an irresistible proof of His victory over death—namely, His appearing publicly in the towns and villages of Judæa during the forty days of His sojourn on earth. On the contrary, He showed Himself only to a few of His followers; and when He chose to show Himself to "above five hundred brethren at once," He made it a condition that it should be "on a mountain in Galilee."

But it is not in the Bible only that we find evidence of mystery in God's dealings with His creatures: we find it in secular history also. Undoubtedly there has been, on the whole, a steady progress of the human race. Interruptions there have been here and there, and retrogressions; yet, viewing the race generally, there has been a distinct advance in knowledge and in well-being. And Christians will find in that fact a proof that God has been at work in the history of mankind, guiding man's selfish motives and passions to His own wise ends. Of Cyrus He said: "I have

guided thee, though thou hast not known Me."[1] And doubtless He has guided monarchs and statesmen in all ages, though they have not known it. But how slow has been the process. How often has God's purpose been thwarted, as if some malignant power were able to dispute, not altogether unsuccessfully, the sovereignty of the world with the God whom we adore; thus justifying the boast of the Evil One to our Lord, that he could give Him "all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them," if He would only worship him. How is this, if it be indeed true that God "doeth according to His will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay His hand, or say unto Him, What doest Thou?"[2]

Thus we see the evolution of the Divine will partially eclipsed everywhere by an atmosphere of mystery: in the operations of nature, along the course of history, in the preparation for the Incarnation, as revealed in the Bible. And we have the explanation of it all in the text: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." "Mysteries are revealed unto the meek." It is so even in the realm of physical science. The greatest discoverers have always been men of humble and patient minds.

[1] Isa. xlv. 5. [2] Dan. iv. 35.

And certainly in the sphere of grace partial ignorance is one of God's ordained means of discipline and education. Just as an eclipse of one of the heavenly bodies enables astronomers to make discoveries which would otherwise be impossible, so the partial obscuration of God's presence and purpose in creation serves in the long run to make us know Him better Faith is the faculty which enables us to see God and faith is rooted in humility and purity. Knowledge derived through the intellect alone is apt to make men arrogant and shallow. It is "with the heart" that "man believeth unto righteousness."

The promise of the text, though embracing this life, carries us beyond it. It tells of a world not far away, not beyond the planetary spaces, but close to us, underlying the world of sense—a world of beauty beyond the ken of science and beyond the dreams of poet or of artist; and it says that a special faculty is necessary to see this world also—a faculty special in regard to its subject, but within the reach of all. Science is not necessary, nor poetic imagination, nor artistic genius. The key that unlocks the mysteries of this world is purity of heart. Would you understand the mystery which we celebrate to-day? Then cultivate purity of heart. Strive after meekness, holiness, truth, unselfishness. Consider

human nature as it is in itself, so full of paradox, so insoluble a riddle, if this life be all; the creature of a day, with thoughts and yearnings that embrace eternity. Men of science tell us that instincts which are generic must be based on truth; that the existence of a natural demand proves that the demand is meant to be supplied; that the fluttering of the young bird in the nest implies an atmosphere in which the bird can float by the beating of its wings; that thirst implies drink; hunger, food; eyes, light. Physical science must therefore be true to its own teaching, must be logical, must carry its reasoning to its legitimate conclusion. Belief in a spiritual world and craving for communion with it are instincts as universal as thirst or hunger. So is prayer. There is no race of man which does not believe in a spiritual world, and which does not, in moments of anguish, lift up beseeching hands and imploring eyes to a being believed to be supreme over human destiny, who hears and answers prayer. How shall we account for that universal instinct? As well believe that there is nothing in space to attract the mariner's compass as that there is no God behind the veil of visible phenomena to attract the mariner's prayer.

The great fact of Christmas Day is the answer to

another of the aboriginal instincts of humanity. Throughout all ages the universal heart of man has cried aloud for a mediator—a being who should bridge over the chasm which divides the Creator from the creature. Job gave vivid expression to this universal craving when, acknowledging the impossibility of man justifying himself before God, he exclaimed: "For He is not a man as I am that I should answer Him, and we should come together in judgment; neither is there any daysman betwixt us that might lay his hand upon us both." In other words, God was too remote from man to comprehend man's temptations and frailties; and there was no daysman, no arbiter, no mediator who could lay his hand on both, touching the human nature with one hand and the divine with the other, and bringing them together, interpreting them to each other and causing a union between them. Christmas Day is the answer to that passionate appeal. The Eternal Son of God, born of a woman, appeared on earth as "the Desire of all nations"—the Daysman for whom Job longed — bringing into inseparable union the human nature and the divine.

How was this done? By the advent of a second Head and Representation of our race, with a humanity disentailed from the hereditary taint derived from our

father Adam. To this end He was "conceived by the Holy Ghost," and "born of the Virgin Mary:" the offspring of a human mother, but not of a human father. Hence the unique name which He assumed—"the Son of man;" not of a man, you see. He is the Son, the Offspring, of humanity, but not of any particular man. Nor need we have any difficulty in accepting this article of the creed even on the ground of science. For virgin births are unquestionable and admitted facts in the kingdom of nature; and indeed, if we are to believe biologists, the transmission of life was unisexual before it became bisexual. Our Lord then took human nature, not any individual person, into eternal union with His own Divine Person. He assumed manhood, not a man, and therefore has no human personality. A human nature He has in all its integrity: a human body, with all that constitutes a human body; a human soul, with all the attributes of a human soul; but not a human person. And for the obvious reason that His assumption of the nature of any individual man, though it might save that man, would not affect the race. Moreover, there would in that case be two persons, not one. Jesus of Nazareth would be one person; the Eternal Son of God would be another. Viewed then in the personality of His double nature, He is not God in

man, or man in God, but God-man; a Divine Person, uniting the two natures of God and man in His single personality.

So then we are no longer an outcast race. We are citizens of heaven and, in the bold phrase of the Apostle, "partakers of the Divine nature." A glorious privilege; but what a responsibility! "Ye are not your own." The nature which we bear we share with the Eternal Son of God. It is not ours to mar or to defile. It is His; and therefore to degrade it by sin is, in the fearful language of Holy Scripture, to "crucify to ourselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame."

XII.

HOW TO MEET TEMPTATION.

"*Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego answered and said to the king, O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and He will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.*"—DANIEL iii. 16-18.

WE may think it extraordinary, almost incredible, that any intelligent human being could be guilty of the folly and absurdity recorded of Nebuchadnezzar in this chapter. Yet Nebuchadnezzar was by no means a bad specimen of an Oriental absolute monarch. His character on the whole, as we gather it from the Book of Daniel, was fine and noble. Yet here we find this king, so great, so intelligent, so generous and magnanimous by natural instinct, and with a mind singularly open to right impulses, so besotted, nevertheless, with the fumes of irresponsible power, that

he commands the educated representatives of his subjects to fall down and worship a golden image—perhaps of himself—that he had set up in the chief province of his kingdom. We read of the same kind of folly in the lives of several of the Roman emperors, some of whom had divine honours paid to them in life as well as after death. It was very irrational and very stupid; but is it not at bottom and in essence the same kind of folly as all are guilty of who accept, perhaps covet, praise and honour to which they know they are not entitled? Is not the difference one of degree rather than of kind?

It is not of Nebuchadnezzar, however, that I wish to speak to you just now, but of the three Jewish youths who braved his wrath for conscience' sake. There is not in the annals of martyrdom a nobler answer than theirs to the astonished and enraged king, who had them at his mercy—an answer so calm, so dignified, so courteous, yet so firm: "O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace and He will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." The king was willing to

overlook the first offence. It might have been an oversight, or due to ignorance, or Jewish prejudices; for they were Jewish nobles, who had risen in the land of their captivity to the highest posts in the empire. Therefore the king was willing to give them a second chance. If they obeyed his order, now that the facts had been put plainly before them, nothing more would be said, and they would retain the favour of the king and the places of trust and dignity to which he had promoted them. But the minds of the three youths were made up. "We are not careful to answer thee in this matter." They required no time for consideration. The case was quite plain and simple. Idolatry was wrong, and they could have no part in it. It was not a question of pleasing their king, but of obeying their God; and their duty to God forbade their obeying the king. It was a plain matter of right and wrong, and there was an end of it. There was no room for parleying or reconsideration. They must just obey their consciences and take the consequences. "Who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands?" asked the proud king when he put the alternative before them. "If it be so," was the quiet answer, "our God whom we serve *is* able to deliver us." Of God's power to deliver them out of the despot's hands they had no doubt;

and they believed that He would deliver them. But that was a wholly irrelevant consideration. It had no sort of bearing on the question. Whether God would or would not deliver His servants from the power of the king did not really matter; He might have good reasons for not delivering them. What did matter was that God's will should be done at all hazards. If it was His will to deliver them, well and good; but if not, well and good also. It was not a matter which admitted of argument or discussion. They must do their duty and leave the issue in God's hands. Let the king heat his furnace seven times more: that made no difference to Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. For them there were just the two alternatives of obedience to God or to Nebuchadnezzar. They could not serve both, and their choice was made irrevocably. By his impious question—"Who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands?"—Nebuchadnezzar had offered an affront to the God of Israel, and these brave men, to vindicate the honour of their God, declared that He could deliver them, and probably would. But their service was not of that sordid kind which bargains for reward. God might call them to martyrdom, as He had called others before them. So be it; they were ready to obey the summons. It is this counting

of the cost, this calm balancing of the alternatives, that makes the answer of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego so exceedingly noble.

Countless generations of human beings have passed over the earth since that striking scene was enacted in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon, and Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego are gone with the rest. But, though dead, they still speak, still point the way which men ought to follow when pleasure or safety beckons in one direction, and duty and conscience in another. Religious devotion, right conduct, self-denying service, may not further a man's prospects in this world. "But if not," what does it matter? He must just go on as if fortune smiled upon him. He may be deceived, betrayed, robbed, slandered. That must make no difference in his conduct when it is a plain question of right or wrong, of obeying God or man; no, not even if the furnace should be heated seven times more. You may be interested in some cause, religious or political, which you sincerely believe to be right. But it may be an unpopular cause, and the advocacy of it may expose you to unpopularity, to ridicule, to odium, perhaps to serious inconvenience and loss. Very well; you must bear it, though the furnace be heated seven times more. You may not be able to attend to

your religious duties without inconvenience, cannot attend the daily services of this cathedral without some trouble and self-sacrifice. But if you believe your Master's promise, that He is present where two or three are gathered together in His name, is it not your duty, ought it not to be your pleasure, to put yourself to some trouble and self-denial for His sake who endured the Cross for you? Or you are perhaps employed in some workshop or manufactory, and are derided for attending to your religious duties, for going to church and receiving the Holy Communion after due preparation. You must not mind it. It is but a small trial compared with that which the three noble Jewish captives had to meet; and yet you will be bearing witness on behalf of God and serving Him bravely as they did, if you resist your temptation.

Another lesson which we may learn from the answer of the three youths is that true success is not always measured by apparent success. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego might have made some compromise with their consciences, might have found means of avoiding the scrutiny of their accusers by occupying a position where they could not have been so successfully watched, might possibly even have persuaded the king, before he had committed himself

and his dignity was engaged in enforcing obedience to the royal command, to excuse their absence from the ceremony. But they took a simpler view of their duty. They obeyed the royal command as far as conscience allowed, and disobeyed the moment it became necessary to testify against idolatry. For the moment they appeared to court ruin needlessly in facing a horrible death, which they might, by a little management, have avoided. As it happened, they achieved a grand success even from a worldly point of view. But their success would have been none the less grand had the fire consumed them. And the nobility of their conduct lay in their ignorance of the issue. That God *could* defend them they knew. That He would see fit to deliver them they did not know. But they did not trouble themselves concerning the alternatives: that was a detail which did not touch the question of duty. Worldly success was a thing which did not enter into their calculations. Nor should it enter into ours. God makes no promise of success in this world; failure—what seems failure at the time—is more commonly the lot of His faithful servants. It is not the quantity of our work that He regards, but the quality of it. He is less anxious that we should fulfil our task—for He can make up for our deficiencies—than that we

should do our best; for what He desires is the improvement of our characters, and that requires the co-operation of our own wills with His. Good men seldom live to carry out their purposes. But that is no reason for discouragement. Temporary failure may be only a delayed success; and even the failure may have the effect of securing the final triumph. The man who champions a good cause, or strives to lodge some great truth in the convictions of society, has not necessarily failed if he die before any sign of success is visible. But he has failed if he has given up trying, if he has lost faith in the truth, if he has forsaken his ideal. What a failure the preaching and miracles of Jesus of Nazareth must have seemed when He died on Calvary! And if seeming failure was the note of His mission, what wonder that it should also be the badge of His followers in every age. The best work done for God is, after all, fractional—a small part of the whole. Each generation, as it passes away, leaves its work incomplete—some things begun which it could not finish. The next generation takes up the task, and then leaves a fresh legacy of unfulfilled effort to its successor. One generation sows the seed; another reaps the harvest. Abraham is the typical example of faithful work; but he died in faith centuries

before the fulfilment of his hopes. He rejoiced to see the Redeemer's day, but it was across the gulf of nigh two thousand years. And Abraham's experience was the experience of all the saints of old, of whom we read that "these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." We are necessary, that is, to their perfection: our work is the complement of theirs. One age, or one body of men, labour, and others enter into their labour. That is the law of progress. The race is not always to the swift nor the battle to the strong; nor is it the soldier who falls in the breach that reaps the fruits of victory.

It follows from this that moral responsibility is not necessarily connected with great things. Success is a matter of degrees and stages, and human conduct gets its quality and value from its relation to the kingdom of God. Grasp that truth, and you will see that no action need be insignificant. Faithful service has nothing to do with the greatness or smallness of the trust. Is not that the lesson of the story of Eden? The obligation laid upon our first parents was but a small one—to abstain from eating the fruit of a single tree. Naaman had but a light task

assigned to him to cure his leprosy—a journey of some thirty miles to bathe in the Jordan. But those small duties tested the character as surely as the government of a kingdom would have done; perhaps better. It is our Lord's own doctrine: "He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much." And we apply the same test in our dealings with each other. Men will not trust in business of importance one who has abused their confidence in a small matter.

Remember, then, that no act or thought of ours stands by itself. It is always related to something else. The little handle of the steam valve on a locomotive is a small thing; but turn it, and you start the engine with a whole train behind it. In the same way, an act which may seem to us trivial will carry a train of consequences after it. Our rashness, or neglect, or carelessness, may cause a disaster in the moral world as surely as a lighted spark, heedlessly dropped in a powder magazine, may lay half a town in ruins. One false note will spoil the finest piece of music, and one little sin, as we deem it, may ruin the most promising character, involving it in a network of unforeseen consequences out of which there may be no escape.

Flee temptation therefore as you would flee the very breath of the Evil One. Never dally with it. When duty is plain refuse all discussion and parleying. Turn your back upon it and bid it depart as it it were some visible fiend tempting you to your ruin. Remember the story of Balaam. When the tempter's messengers came to him "with the rewards of divination in their hands," instead of dismissing them at once, the prophet invited them to "lodge" with him for the night, that he might consider the matter. And when God refused to let him sell his soul to the tempter, "and Balak sent yet again princes, more and more honourable than" the first, the prophet said: "Tarry ye also here this night, that I may know what the Lord will say unto me more." Those glittering bribes had taken root in his heart. He had "lodged" them there for a night, and they would not depart. He hoped that God would reward his first obedience by letting him "receive the wages of unrighteousness" when the temptation returned. And so God allowed the unhappy man to meet his doom—the doom which he had brought upon himself, and from which even Omnipotence could not have saved him. Whether Balaam went to Balak or not did not matter after the prophet had deliberately lodged the temptation a second time in his heart. His ruin

was then accomplished. He had sinned against light, preferring evil to good, "but having," as he acknowledged, "his eyes open." It is the old, old story, dallying with temptation in the field of the imagination, bribing conscience with fair promises and good resolutions, and then riding to the land of Moab to receive Balak's honours while refusing to do Balak's bidding. Yet he did Balak's bidding after all; for the story goes on to relate how Balaam, having failed to obtain leave to curse Israel with his lips, cursed them in a more effectual way by persuading Balak to tempt God's people to idolatry by means of the women of Midian. Thus it is that men pass on to ruin over a road paved with good intentions. The only safe course is that of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego: "We are not careful to answer thee in this matter." We need no time for deliberation. Obedience to the will of God is the only possible alternative when duty is clear, even though the furnace be heated "seven times more."

XIII.

THE SECRET OF DANIEL'S HEROISM.

"*Now when Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house; and his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime.*"—DAN. vi. 10.

PERHAPS the most striking fact in the whole of this story, that which appeals most powerfully to our feelings of admiration and sympathy, is the dramatic contrast between the evidently restless activity of Daniel's enemies and the perfectly unconcerned manner in which Daniel himself received the news of their success. There is a moral grandeur in it surpassing in some respects even that of his three fellow-countrymen when they refused so bravely, yet with such calm and courteous dignity, to worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar had set up in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon. They could not, even had they wished, have escaped the

alternative of obedience or disobedience. As great officers of State, they were bound to be present at the dedication of the king's idolatrous statue; and being present they had only the alternative of acting like the rest or openly defying the king's command. Daniel was under no such necessity. He was one, if not the chief, of the presidents whom Darius had set over the hundred and twenty satraps or viceroys who governed the provinces of his realm, and it was the king's intention to set him over the whole empire. The private house of so great a personage was sacred from intrusion; or if there were, as seems probable, rooms to which there was free entry, there must certainly have been a part of the house to which there could have been no admittance for any one without Daniel's special permission. Thither Daniel might have retired for his daily devotions when he learnt that the interdict had gone forth against prayer to any one but Darius for the space of thirty days. Or he might have changed his hours of devotion, which were doubtless well known to his enemies. Or, knowing that God reads the secrets of the heart, and has no need of articulate words, though He demands them for our good, Daniel might have prayed and returned thanks inwardly while his tongue was silent. Or he might have anticipated the craft of

the conspirators by going beforehand to the king and exposing their designs.

Daniel did nothing of the kind. He made no effort at all to avert the dreadful doom that hung over him. He let matters take their course, and went on the even tenor of his way, not making the slightest difference in his mode of life. It might be God's will that His faithful servant should suffer martyrdom. He would therefore leave himself entirely in God's hands, believing that whatever might happen would in the end be for the best. The first article of his creed was the supremacy, the omniscient sovereignty of God, who "doeth according to His will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth." The thought expressed by a poet of our own, lately taken from us, in the words, "God's in his heaven, all's right with the world," was to Daniel a vivid reality. To him God's omnipresence was not a phrase, but a fact, which made the conduct of life an easy matter. Like David, but with greater steadfastness of purpose, he had "set God always before him," for he knew that God was on his right hand, and therefore he could not fall, whatever might happen to his body. This attitude of mind, this way of looking at things, had become habitual to Daniel. He had practised it for years, so that it became a

second nature to him. We have a proverb which says that "practice makes perfect," and it is undoubtedly true that anything which we have been in the habit of doing regularly for years becomes at last so much a part of ourselves that we do it automatically and unconsciously, just as we have by practice learnt to balance ourselves while walking or standing without being able to explain the number, combination, and succession of muscular movements which enable us to do so. But this facility of right action does not detract from the merit of it; on the contrary, it enhances it, just as the facility with which an accomplished musician sings or plays is a witness to the pains he took to master his art. That is the reason why good men and women, those servants of God whom the world recognizes as saints, find it easy and natural to act in a manner which excites the wonder and admiration of mankind. And that is also the reason why the saints speak of themselves in terms which sound almost exaggerated and affected, but which is in reality the sincere expression of their feelings. When St. Paul called himself "the chief of sinners," he meant it. The fact is that a man's vision grows clearer the higher he ascends in the spiritual life, and he thus becomes more conscious of his shortcomings than he was

on the lower level on which he had previously been walking.

That is the secret of Daniel's heroism. His habit of realizing God's presence, of seeing Him ever at the helm of human affairs, made him indifferent to his own fate so long as he did his duty faithfully to God and man. All the rest he left in God's keeping knowing that He would do all things well. And therefore the machinations of his enemies and the signature of the king to the fatal interdict did not disturb him. He performed his daily devotions at the usual hours and in the usual place without the least effort at concealment. To have performed his devotions at other hours or in another place might have baffled his enemies, but at the cost of leaving it in doubt whether Daniel was loyal to his God. And that was a thought which Daniel could not endure. He was there to bear witness to the supreme majesty and eternal sovereignty of the God of Israel, and that witness he would bear, cost what it might. And so, with his windows open as usual towards Jerusalem, "he kneeled three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime." Nor did it seem to him that he was doing anything grand, or heroic, or unusual. He knew the penalty—the lions' den and a horrible death. But that was a

detail which in his view had no bearing at all on the question.

Let me remark, in passing, on Daniel's habit of praying, looking through an open window towards Jerusalem. You will find the explanation in the First Book of Kings, viii. 46–50, in a noble passage in Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the Temple. If the children of Israel, said Solomon, should sin so grievously as to cause God to deliver them into captivity in a foreign land, and they repented there, "and pray unto Thee towards the land which Thou gavest unto their fathers, the city which Thou hast chosen, and the house which I have built for Thy name; then hear Thou their prayer and their supplication in heaven, Thy dwelling place, and maintain their cause." It was in obedience to that injunction that Daniel prayed with his window open towards the desolate land of his fathers and its ruined capital and desecrated sanctuary. Are we not in some danger nowadays of making too little of these outward symbols of the heart's homage? God is a spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth. Yes, but He demands the worship of the whole man, body and spirit; and they do not worship Him acceptably who do not worship Him with their bodies as well as with their spirits.

May we not indeed suspect that the spirit is not really worshipping when the body refuses to show any sign of reverence—sitting, for example, instead of kneeling or standing; for both kneeling and standing are attitudes of worship, but sitting never. And do you not see a beautiful symbolism in the general and ancient custom of turning towards the East as we say the Creed, when you know the history of the custom, which is as follows?—In the temples of paganism the idol generally stood at the west end. In the early ages of Christianity, therefore, it became a custom that when a catechumen was baptized he turned his face to the west, the place of the idol, and the region also of the setting sun and the darkness, while he was making his profession of renouncing the devil and all his works. But when he began to recite the Christian Creed he turned round and faced eastward, the region of the rising sun, from which also our Lord tells us that He will come, like lightning shining from the east even to the west, to judge mankind.

But how did Daniel acquire his wonderful habit of leaving himself with such serene equanimity in the keeping of Almighty God? For you may be sure he was not born with the habit. We read, indeed, that he was naturally a devout and spiritually minded

man. But he was fallible like the rest of us, and we may assume that he had temptations to fight against and overcome. How did he do it? You will find it all explained in the first chapter of the Book of Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar chose four young princes of the royal blood of Judah to be trained for service at his court, and ordered that special provision should be made for their food and drink during their three years' training. Of those four princes, Daniel was one, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego being the others. Daniel contrived that the rich food and wine provided for them by the king should be exchanged for pulse and water. So early—for he was then but a boy—did he begin to discipline his passions, by "keeping under his body," as St. Paul expresses it. The body has great power over the soul, and if you subdue the appetites of the body you have gone a long way towards the mastery of the passions generally.

Now we Christians have many more privileges and advantages, and much more light, than Daniel had. The light of the Gospel had not shone upon him. For him God had not appeared in human form, and died upon the cross, and risen victorious over death. He was in twilight as compared with us, on whom the Sun of Righteousness has risen with healing in His

wings. Yet how many of us realize our closeness to God and to Eternity as Daniel realized it? He always saw the actual in the light of the ideal, the material in the light of the spiritual. To him the spiritual world was the real world, and the spiritual part of man, not the perishable body, the man's true self. St. Paul has expressed the same idea as an encouragement to bear patiently the trials of this life. "Our light affliction," he says, "which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; whilst we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal." Daniel's faith in the spiritual world—its immensity, its mystery, its splendour—was doubtless fostered by his profession; for in addition to the secular office which he held in the kingdom of Babylon, he belonged to the priestly caste or hierarchy of the Chaldæan Magi, who were students of the stars, but must not be confounded with quacks who in our day take the name of astrologers. Those wise men of old were diligent and reverent students of nature, and of the heavenly bodies in particular. And, indeed, who can tell how many of His secret things God may reveal to those who reverently try to spell out His

will through the laws and phenomena of His own creation? We know that the wise men who came, guided by a star, from the East to greet and worship the infant Saviour in the manger of Bethlehem belonged to the order of Magi, of whom Daniel was chief. And because they were reverent and teachable they learnt more from the study of the stars than the wise and learned in Jerusalem were able to learn from the written oracles of God, those inspired Scriptures which the Scribes and Pharisees had at their finger-ends, but which they had failed to understand. Daniel, be sure, was a careful and reverent student of the stars, which are never seen in our dull sky with the luminous splendour and mysterious tremulous motion with which they shine under the serene clear sky of the East. Daniel, however, was not an astronomer in our sense of the word. We know far more than he did about the laws which regulate the motions and mutual relations of the heavenly bodies; far more about their chemical composition. But there is such a thing as darkness from excessive light, and may it not be that our greater scientific knowledge has had the effect of hiding from us spiritual truths with which Daniel's purity of heart and childlike spirit had made him familiar? We regard the light of day as a revealer, and so it is. Without it we

should have no knowledge of the wondrous beauty which in infinite variety and boundless measure the Almighty Maker has spread over the face of our planet. But has it ever occurred to you that if the light of day is a revealer it is also a concealer, hiding infinitely more than it reveals? Night has greater wonders to show us than day. Imagine the amazement and dismay of our first parents on the day of their creation as they saw the shadows of evening closing around them, and the sun descending in the western sky till it disappeared below the horizon. The gradual fading away of the light of day must have filled their inexperienced minds with terror; which, however, would soon be succeeded by wonder and delight when they saw the stars, as you can only see them in the East, trooping out in all the glory of their multitudinous array. Thus you see that light itself may be a concealer, when by its glare or nearness, or even by its glory, it hides other lights from our view—the light of heavenly bodies far more glorious than our sun.

Have we not in this fact an explanation of much that would otherwise perplex us in the chequered career of Christianity? Has not the nearer light, while revealing important truths, often hidden other truths, equally, if not more important, from our eyes?

The light of Christianity in the first centuries of our religion so exposed the darkness of the Pagan world that crowds of Christians thought it their duty to abjure the world altogether and flee from the haunts of men into solitary deserts. That was an exaggeration of the truth that Christians are bound to live a life of detachment from this world; in it, but not of it; mixing with it, as the Son of man mixed with publicans and sinners, in order to reclaim it. I do not mean that there is no room or use in the Christian Church for those who may have a special vocation for a life of contemplation and study and devotion; for Mary, sitting at the feet of Jesus in listening adoration, as well as for Martha, diligent in active service. Indeed, one of the special needs of our day is more time for meditation and reflection. We have gone to the opposite extreme of the eremites of old, and would be none the worse for some infusion of their spirit. We live so much in the whirl and din of things temporal that we are in serious danger of losing sight of things eternal. The recoil from one excess has driven us too far in the opposite direction. So again when western Christendom was startled by the sudden flood of light from classical antiquity which flashed upon it from the East on the fall of Constantinople, the effect was a temporary obscuration of the light of

the Gospel, ending in a Paganized Christianity. In like manner there have been men so dazzled by the light of the Incarnation, so fascinated by the thought of God becoming man, that they have lost sight of the divinity of Christ; while others have gone to the opposite extreme of losing sight of His humanity in the glory of His Divine nature. Others, again, have been so impressed by the idea of God's irresistible sovereignty that they have come to deny the freedom of the human will, and imputed to the God of love and mercy conduct which would be condemned as cruel and unjust in an earthly sovereign. And this has led, by a natural reaction, to the merging of God's attribute of eternal justice in that of His beneficence and providential fatherhood.

But perhaps the most striking illustration that can be given of the blinding effect of a flood of fresh light close to us is the way in which the marvellous discoveries of modern science have closed the minds of so many against the truths of Christianity. We have a remarkable instance of this in one of Darwin's letters, published in his Life.[1] There he confesses and deplores his loss of interest in the fine arts. Music, poetry, painting, which used to give him pleasure, lost all their charm for him; and his own explana-

[1] i. p. 100, 101. See Appendix F.

tion, after analyzing the possible causes, is that his mind had been occupied so long in collecting, and grinding, and classifying material facts, that the spiritual side of his nature had become atrophied. The explanation goes farther than Darwin carried it, for it accounts for the failure of able and honest minds to read the volume of evidence in which Nature bears witness, in so many ways, to the existence of Him who made her. And this consideration shows us that, after all, the knowledge of God is reached through the heart more than through the intellect. It was not to his intellectual endowments that Daniel owed his extraordinary influence at the courts of four successive monarchs in the kingdom of Babylon. He owed it to his personal influence: to that subtle virtue which is always going out of a man who lives consistently a life of entire unselfishness and absolute trust in God. And what gave their wonderful power to the first preachers of Christianity? They were, for the most part, unlearned Jewish peasants, with no intellectual superiority above their fellows; yet they went forth to claim the world's allegiance to a crucified carpenter of Galilee; and the story which they told, backed by lives like theirs, triumphed at last over the learning and philosophy of Greece, and over the statecraft and military power of imperial Rome.

And this personal influence is commonly most powerful when it is exercised most unconsciously. It is also within reach of the humblest. Remember how the little maid of Israel was the means of curing the great captain of the armies of Syria of his leprosy, and leading him to the knowledge of the true God. See what influence she gained by a life of simple goodness. Some chance words of hers were reported in the family of her master, and thence in the court of the king; and all felt that if the little maid of Israel said it there must be something in it; and so her advice was taken at once without a question. Some of you may remember a beautiful allegory told by the poet from whom I have already quoted. He tells the story of a simple peasant maiden inhabiting a small town near Venice. She had but one holiday in the year—New Year's Day; and on one of those anniversaries she resolved to enact in fancy the lives of the four happiest persons, as she believed, in the little town. And so, dividing her day into four separate portions, she started in the morning for the house of the first of the four whom she had chosen as her ideals of a happy life; and as she passed the house she sang a simple song. The inmates of the house had just committed an atrocious crime, and were beginning to enjoy the fruits of their sin, when the

singing of the maiden fell upon their ears. The words went home. They pricked the consciences of the guilty pair, and made them loathe themselves for the crime they had committed. The maiden's singing had a similar effect in each of the three other houses, where a sin was about to be committed as the singer passed. But the maid herself was entirely unconscious of the good that she had done. That is a parable of the good that any one of us may do unconsciously if we live up to our profession, and, like Daniel, commit ourselves and our ways to God, leaving the issue entirely in His hands. Daniel did not think that he was doing anything grand or heroic when he worshipped God "as he did aforetime," though he knew that the penalty was the lions' den. Still less did he think that the fame of his unconscious heroism would resound throughout the world till the end of time. He never thought of consequences at all. He had a duty to do, and he did it as a matter of course. It did not occur to him that there was any other alternative. And now here are we, thousands of years afterwards, in a distant land of which Daniel had never heard, bracing ourselves up, as I trust, by his example, to do our duty bravely and simply and unostentatiously in whatever way it may please God to try us. But Daniel, remember, acquired his

habit of obedience to duty by careful schooling of himself beforehand. He began young to train himself—to restrain his appetites and curb his passions. Obedience grew into a habit and became to him a second nature; so that when the temptation came, it cost him little effort to overcome it. If you would conquer like him you must discipline your wills like him. In spiritual as in physical warfare previous preparation is the only sure condition of victory.

XIV.

NAAMAN THE SYRIAN.

"Now Naaman, captain of the host of the king of Syria, was a great man with his master, and honourable, because by him the Lord had given deliverance unto Syria: he was also a mighty man in valour, but he was a leper."—2 KINGS v. 1.

THE story of Naaman the Syrian is one of the most interesting in the Old Testament. It arrests our attention at once by its series of dramatic contrasts. Naaman was a great general, successful in war, commander-in-chief of the armies of Syria, wealthy, happy in his domestic life, and held in the highest honour by his king; "but he was a leper," the victim of a foul disease which made him loathsome to himself and others, and against which human skill was unavailing. There was no hope of cure; and yet hope reached him from a most unexpected quarter—from a little slave girl carried out of the land of Israel by some of Naaman's troopers, and now a serving maid to his wife. On her advice the King of Syria sends his

favourite captain to the King of Israel with a letter asking him to heal the leper. And when the King of Israel, in alarm, interprets this as a device to seek a quarrel against him, the prophet Elisha undertakes to do what his king has pronounced impossible for man. Then there is the contrast between Elisha's reception of the great man and the pomp and ceremony with which the great man expected to be met; between the believed incurability of the disease and the childish remedy (as it seemed to Naaman) which the prophet proposed; between the unreasonable rage of Naaman and the common sense of his slaves; between the recovery of the leper and the poetic justice which inflicted his leprosy on the covetous Gehazi.

But let us consider some of the most striking points of the story.

Naaman's outburst of indignation at the prophet's contemptuous treatment of him was very natural, however unreasonable. To make a troublesome journey from Damascus to Samaria in order to be told, "Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean," might well seem to him a cruel mockery. And when we look at the facts from his point of view, we shall not wonder that he "was wroth, and went away, and said, I thought, He will surely come out to me,

and stand and call on the name of the Lord his God, and move his hand up and down over the place, and recover the leper." To receive, instead of this, a message through the prophet's servant, bidding him go on what he thought a fool's errand of thirty miles over a rough country, must have been a severe shock to the proud Syrian. And he reasoned like a sensible man of the world when he exclaimed: "Are not Abana and Pharpar,[1] rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? May I not wash in them and be clean?" The Abana and Pharpar are certainly clearer streams than the turbid Jordan, and Naaman might well ask why he should have travelled so far if his leprosy could be cleansed by dipping seven times in a river. Was there anything in the Jordan which the Abana lacked, that it could suddenly heal a leper? Nothing that the eye could see or chemical analysis could discover. So Naaman "turned and went away in a rage." But his slaves took a more sensible view of the matter. "They came near, and spoke unto him and said: My father, if the prophet had bid thee do some great thing, wouldest thou not have done it? how much rather, then, when he saith unto thee,

[1] The Pharpar is a branch of the Abana, and both are branches of the Warada, which is fed by the snow and streams of Hermon, and which, as it enters the plain of Damascus, loses its name, and is divided into six streams, of which the Abana is the largest.

Wash and be clean." Admirable reasoning! so simple, yet so cogent. And it says much for the character of Naaman that his slaves should have been on such affectionate terms with him, and that he should have listened so readily to their advice. Elisha evidently knew his man, either by an inspired instinct, or by knowledge gained in an ordinary way; knew the sort of treatment best calculated to draw out the latent nobility of Naaman's nature.

I have said that Naaman's reasoning, though altogether wrong, as the event proved, was natural from his point of view; how natural, we may learn from its prevalence among ourselves. Why do men make light of Sacramental ordinances? of Baptism and the Holy Communion, for example? Is it not because they reason like Naaman? Why should the water of Baptism be efficacious to cleanse from sin—that leprosy of the soul of which the leprosy of the body was a type? The water of Baptism can no more, of itself, cleanse from sin than the water of the Jordan could, of itself, cleanse from leprosy. In the one case, as in the other, the cleansing power is from God; and in both it is man's obedience that calls God's power into action. If Naaman had obeyed his first impulse and gone back to Damascus in a rage, he would have died a leper. So now, if we wilfully

neglect any of the means which God has ordained for the bestowal of His gifts, we have no right to complain if we are sent empty away. Almighty God is not tied to His own ordinances. He can dispense with them if He sees fit, or make up for any lack which does not come of wilful disobedience. But it is at our peril that we presume to dispense ourselves from strict obedience to His command when its terms are sufficiently plain.

Unlike the nine ungrateful lepers whom our Lord cured, Naaman "returned to the man of God, he and all his company, and came and stood before him. And he said, Behold, now I know that there is no God in all the earth, but in Israel: now therefore, I pray thee, take a blessing of thy servant." And when the prophet refused, Naaman begged for two mules' burden of earth that he might erect at home in Damascus an altar of the sacred soil to the God of Israel. "For thy servant," said he, "will henceforth offer neither burnt offering nor sacrifice unto other gods, but unto the Lord." But there was a difficulty in the matter which troubled the conscience of this fine and manly Gentile. "In this thing the Lord pardon thy servant, that when my master goeth into the house of Rimmon to worship, and he leaneth on my hand, and I bow myself in the house of Rimmon;

when I bow down myself in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing." And Elijah bade him "go in peace"; not directly sanctioning this external homage to idolatry, yet not formally forbidding it. Naaman evidently went away in the belief that he might worship the true God in private, while continuing to bow ceremonially in the house of Rimmon, thereby dissembling his change of faith. How shall we explain the prophet's apparent acquiescence in this compromise with idolatry, so different from the conduct of Daniel and his three noble countrymen when the alternative of a horrible death or of dissembling their faith was placed before them?

In answering that question we must bear in mind that the case of Naaman differs in a very important point from that of Daniel and his companions. They belonged to "a peculiar people," "a holy nation," "a chosen generation," a race chosen by God from among the nations to be the custodians and preachers of His gradually revealed will and purpose towards mankind, and to be at the same time a standing witness against idolatry. The Israelite was thus judged by a higher standard than the heathen. He was under "the bond of the covenant." And he often chafed under the stricter obligation required of him. It

needed the destruction of the kingdom of Israel and the seventy years' captivity of that of Judah to root out of his heart this hankering after the lower level of duty, which was "winked at"[1] (to quote the Scripture phrase) in the case of the heathen. The whole case is argued out in the twentieth chapter of the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel. After giving an epitome of their many backslidings and God's long-suffering, the Prophet says to the Jews: "And that which cometh into your mind shall not be at all, that ye say, We will be as the heathen, as the families of the countries, to serve wood and stone. As I live, saith the Lord God, surely with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out, will I rule over you . . . And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant." The Israelite was thus under a higher law than the Gentile, and by that law he was judged. He was in "the bond of the covenant," and could escape neither his privileges nor his responsibilities. It was his bounden duty to bear witness, wherever he was, to the God

[1] Acts xvii. 30. Τοὺς μὲν οὖν χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας ὑπεριδὼν ὁ Θεὸς: *these times of ignorance God overlooked*, either in the sense of passing them over unpunished on the plea of ignorance—the most probable meaning; or cancelling the transgressions of the divine law now that God's will was fully revealed.

of Israel, and never do aught, by word, or deed, or gesture, to make it doubtful whether he served Jehovah, and Him only, with a whole-hearted devotion. It was because Daniel and his companions realized this truth so vividly that they faced, one the den of lions, the others the furnace seven times heated, rather than leave in doubt their loyalty to the God of Israel as the one and only God.

The case of Naaman was different, and he was accordingly judged differently. What would have been a heinous crime in an Israelite might be pardonable in him. With him individually therefore the Prophet dealt as Jehovah had for ages been dealing with the Gentile world at large. His error was "overlooked" by reason of his ignorance. Time was given for the good seed to take root and germinate, in the spirit of Him who appropriated the prophecy of Isaiah: "A bruised reed shall He not break, and the dimly burning flax shall He not quench," but rather fan it gently into flame, "till He send forth judgment unto victory."[1]

Let us glance at the way in which this principle is illustrated in the Providential government of the world, both Gentile and Jewish. As we study

[1] Matt. xii. 20.

history and nature in the light which the Bible throws upon them, we observe two currents running simultaneously, or rather one current with two causes; one secondary and visible, the other primary and invisible. The host of Sennacherib is destroyed in a single night, and scientific men find the explanation in a simoom of the desert sweeping over the land, and slaying where it smites. They may be right as to the secondary cause. But the Bible goes behind the secondary cause: "And it came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred, four score, and five thousand." The healing virtue and periodical disturbance of the water of the Pool of Bethesda would rightly be traced by a scientific man to natural causes; but that does not disprove the Gospel allegation that there was behind the natural causes an angel who "went down at a certain season into the pool and troubled the water." And so, in the progress of the human race, we have the natural historic movement, and behind it the movement of Divine Providence, controlling the natural impulses of men, and shaping their ends, "rough-hew them how they will." In the Greek historian's account of Cyrus, for example, you see the play of ordinary motives and natural forces. God's prophet takes us

behind the scenes and reveals an influence acting on Cyrus, of which the Persian monarch was himself unconscious. "Thus saith the Lord to His anointed Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut. I will go before thee and make the crooked places straight: I will break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron: and I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I, the Lord, which called thee by name, am the God of Israel. For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me. I am the Lord, and there is none else; there is no God beside me: I girded thee, though thou hast not known me."[1]

The great king, who is thus apostrophized by a Hebrew seer of whom he had not heard, works out a purpose to which he was predestined, and fulfils a mission from the Most High, while thinking only of his own aims and schemes. God's mercies are over all His works, and pass the bounds within which He is consciously recognized and intelligently served.

[1] Isaiah xlv. 1–5.

But the result is that He is of necessity served imperfectly. "The morality of a progressive dispensation," as has been well said, "is not the morality with which it starts, but that with which it concludes." God is limited in His dealings with mankind by His respect for the freedom of will with which He has endowed our race. With Gentile and Israelite alike therefore He bore long and patiently, working behind the screen of historical movements, and guiding them towards His own wise purposes, though consuming thousands of years in the process by reason of the perverseness of His human instruments. Abraham goes out from his country, and the secular historian sees only the migration of a Semitic tribe beyond the Euphrates. The Hebrews go down into Egypt, become the slaves of the Pharaohs, and after centuries of bondage defeat their oppressors and subdue the tribes of Canaan; and the secular historian sees only an illustration of the doctrine which tells of the survival of the fittest. But where the philosopher sees only the migration of a tribe under some physical pressure, the religious historian hears the Lord saying unto Abraham, "Get thee out from thy kindred and from thy father's house unto a land that I will show thee, and I will make of thee a great nation." Where the one sees Abraham blindly conforming to "the

fierce ritual of Syria,"[1] which bade him slay Isaac, the other hears God say, "Take now thy son, thine only son, and offer him upon one of the mountains that I will show thee of." Where the one sees only the natural uprising of an enslaved people, the other sees God beginning to mould a nation to preserve and transmit His truth.

The Bible is thus, as it professes to be, a revelation given "at sundry times and in divers manners." In the Jewish dispensation God reveals Himself gradually—to an individual, a family, a tribe, a nation; a local and national God by degrees unveiling Himself as the Lord and Father of mankind. Of this notion of God as a tribal deity we have a curious example long after the Israelites had entered Palestine. It is not an ignorant Hebrew peasant, but Jephthah, the leader of the nation, who says to the Amorites: "Wilt not thou possess that which Chemosh thy god giveth thee? So whomsoever Jehovah our God shall drive out before us, them will we possess."[2] In the Prophets and Psalms we have a worthier theology, rising from vague presentiments to an almost evangelical fulness. Yet among the mass of the Jews even in the time of our Lord this conception of

[1] Dr. Rowland Williams, in *Essays and Reviews*, p. 6.
[2] Judges xi. 24.

Jehovah as the God of the Jews, but not of the Gentiles, except as an avenging deity, was still prevalent. The doctrine of immortality went through the same process of gradual development; implied, as our Lord showed by reference to the message of God to Moses on Horeb, in many parts of the Old Testament; hinted, assumed; but not clearly and explicitly proclaimed and taught till "life and immortality" was "brought to light by the Gospel."

And the same rule holds good to some extent even after the advent of Christ. He tells His disciples that even to them truth will be revealed gradually: "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." When the Spirit came He would "guide them unto all truth." And their Master employed the interval between His Resurrection and Ascension in unfolding to them, as they could bear it, the mysteries of His kingdom. And yet we find them, on the very eve of His departure, still dreaming of a temporal Messiah reigning in Jerusalem. "When they therefore were come together they asked of Him, saying, Wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?"[1]

The illumination of Pentecost opened their minds to the true character of their Master's kingdom, and

[1] Acts i. 6.

then we find them recognizing the method of gradual development as the law of Divine Providence. Look at the institution of slavery—how long it took to die. Even in our own lifetime a great and obstinate war was waged in its defence by nearly half a continent of enlightened Christian men and women. And not a word is said against slavery by our Lord or His Apostles. They lay down principles which are fatal to it, and which have been gradually undermining it till it is now under the ban of Christendom. But what a time it has taken to bring about this result! Well, that is the characteristic of Divine work: slow progress, and sure results; steady advance, and no retracing of steps. And it is one of the many proofs that the moral and spiritual worlds are under the control of the same all-seeing mind, that we find each marked by the same method of development, as indeed our Lord forewarned us in the parable of the Sower, and in His comparison of the history of His Church to the growth of a tiny seed into a tree in which the fowls of the air would find a lodging. It is the seed sown on a rock that sprouts up suddenly, and as suddenly withers, because it has no roots. There is no hurry in the processes of God, either in the natural or spiritual realm. Evolution by slow degrees has become so much the

watchword of modern science that students of Nature find it hard to understand anything that looks to them like instantaneous achievement, such as they conceive a miracle to be. If, then, scientific men are right in assuring us that it took untold ages to prepare this earth for the habitation of living creatures, why should we be surprised to learn that it took thousands of years to prepare the human race for the incarnation of the Son of God? It is just what the analogy of the natural world should lead us to expect. The perfect society which prophecy pointed out as the outcome of the new Dispensation is not yet come, may indeed be still far distant. But it is coming, though it may never be entirely realized on earth; it is coming through much crudeness and imperfection by the way, and driving the workers and the works of darkness before it as it advances, just as the jungle and its beasts of prey and poisonous reptiles vanish before the pioneers of civilization. In nature's processes we find much that serves merely as the scaffolding to something better, and greater, and more beautiful; and then, when its purpose is fulfilled, passes away. Look at the leaves of the forest. They came forth in freshness and beauty last spring; they waved and rustled through the heat of summer; they served their purpose of

shade and refreshment through the noonday glare, and sheltered the growing fruit; they gathered needful properties from the atmosphere for the nurture of the tree; and now, when the fruit is ripe and their task is done, they fade and, beautifying the landscape by their very death, fall sapless and withered through the autumn haze. Nor does their usefulness end even then, for they help to make soil, out of which other trees will grow, to live in the light of other summers and to battle with the storms of other winters.

Now Naaman was at a stage of spiritual development where it would be unfair to judge his conduct by our standard. Even the average Israelite's knowledge of the true God was then crude and in many ways erroneous. But Naaman had been brought up as an idolater, and at the period of our story appears to have received no instruction at all in true religion. When you come to think of it, the wonder is that even his miraculous cure had in so short a time enlightened him so much. Our Lord did not condemn Nicodemus because he came to Him "by night," not having the courage to come by day. He seized hold of what was good in the timid ruler as the surest way of driving out what was evil; and with such success that Nicodemus soon

acquired courage to defend Jesus in the Sanhedrim,[1] and afterwards went boldly to demand His body of Pilate, that He might give Him an honourable burial, when the disciples themselves "all forsook Him and fled." In this spirit it was that Elisha sent Naaman away "in peace," neither formally sanctioning his bowing in the house of Rimmon, nor formally forbidding it, but leaving the good seed, which had dropped into so good a soil, time to take root and bear fruit. A virgin soil, however naturally good, needs to be treated differently from a soil that has been brought under cultivation. And this, too, must be borne in mind, namely, that in putting his case of conscience before Elisha Naaman had his face in the right direction; he was on his way to the City of Peace; whereas an Israelite who should hesitate in a similar dilemma would have had his face in the wrong direction, and been on his way to the City of Confusion. Give Naaman time, and the probability is that he will find his way to the full truth. Give the man who has been enlightened time, and he is pretty sure to go from bad to worse. Patience is the remedy in the former case; instant decision in the latter. And this may show us why it may be wrong in Churchmen either to forbid in others what

[1] John vii. 50.

they would disapprove in themselves, or to descend to a lower level themselves because charity forbids them to pass judgment on others. Let us take care that, while we encourage the ignorant or the doubter by gentle and sympathetic treatment, we do not fall ourselves below the standard of our profession.

XV.

THE "LITTLE MAID" OF ISRAEL.[1]

"*And the Syrians had gone out by companies, and had brought away captive out of the land of Israel a little maid, and she waited on Naaman's wife.*"—2 KINGS v. 2.

THE first thing that strikes us is the misery of the little maid. Nothing could be more wretched, nothing sadder, than her lot. The neighbouring kingdoms of Israel and Syria were often at war with each other, and even when they were supposed to be at peace bands of rough Syrian soldiers were in the habit of making incursions or raids, as we call them, into the land of Israel, for the purpose of carrying off Israelites into slavery, and stealing their cattle and plundering their goods. It was in one of these forays or raids that the little maid was seized and carried away as a

[1] Preached at the Children's Service in Ripon Cathedral on Sunday November 12, 1893, the Offertory being for the Church Missionary Society.

slave. She had been watching a flock of sheep or goats, as you see little girls doing at the present day in those countries; or had gone to fetch water from a well; or was perhaps only strolling on the mountain-side, when a band of Syrian horsemen swooped down upon her and tore her suddenly from all she loved, and bore her away as a slave into a strange land. We are told very little about her, nothing more than this, that she was a young girl (for the word "little" in the original applies to her age rather than her stature), that she was carried off suddenly as a slave, that she was presented by the soldiers who had seized her to Naaman, who gave her as a waiting-maid to his wife; and that one day she chanced to express a wish that her master were with the prophet of her God in Samaria, for the prophet would cure him of his leprosy. That, and the effect of her words, is all that we are told about the captive maid of Israel. But, little as it is, it tells us, I think, a great deal about the young slave girl and her character. We are told that she was young; we may infer that she was beautiful. It could only be her beauty that made the soldiers who had seized her, instead of doing her any harm, present her as a pleasing offering to their great master, "the captain of the host of the king of Syria."

Just try to picture to yourselves the forlorn condition of the little maid in the hands of her rude captors. After a long, rough, and painful ride, for the most part between barren mountains, broken by many frowning precipices, she suddenly came in sight of one of the fairest scenes in all the world—the plain of Damascus. Behind her, bounding the horizon, was snowy Hermon, so famous in the sacred poetry of her people. All round elsewhere, for miles and miles, lay an ocean of sandy desert, quivering under the shower of sunbeams. But just below her, like a green island in the ocean, lay Damascus, the oldest inhabited city in the world; for it was old even in the days of Abraham, nearly four thousand years ago. Masses of dark refreshing foliage rolled like waves among gardens of brilliant emerald green. And if the season was summer, clusters of the blossoms of the orange, the citron, and the peach lay like foam upon the verdant sea. For many an hour she had seen no water: now it gushed, and gleamed, and sparkled through the plain: the river Warada, which descends from Hermon, having been divided artificially into six streams for purposes of irrigation, the largest stream, called the Abana, running right through the city, and a smaller one, called the Pharpar, running out of it, and passing through what is now called

the Christian quarter of Damascus. It was a beautiful sight, fairer than any on which the eyes of the little maid had ever rested before. But its very beauty would make her all the sadder by its contrast to her own miserable lot. For nothing is more sad than to find ourselves in view of pleasant things which we are forbidden to enjoy. And the little maid, slave girl that she was, could not hope to enjoy any of the beauty on which she now gazed. She did not know what might be in store for her, and the uncertainty would make her almost hate what, under other circumstances, would have been an enticing vision. The more beautiful our surroundings are, the more unhappy are we if we are completely out of harmony with them.

But although her lot was not so bad as she had feared, it was still a very sad one. Think of her, a helpless slave girl in the household of Naaman: young, beautiful, a slave in a strange land. What would naturally be her temptations when the first outburst of her grief was over? She would be tempted, in the first place, to forget her religion. Having no hope of being able to return to her dear home, she would be tempted, if she gave way to her natural desire, to curry favour, as we say, with those about her; to fall in with the customs around her; to forget praying to the God of

her fathers, and to join in the false worship of Damascus, the worship of Rimmon, the idolatrous god of that city. And then she would have another thought troubling her and tempting her to forsake the God of Israel, the Great Jehovah of the Hebrews. She had evidently been well brought up and instructed in the history of God's dealings with her people. Doubtless her family belonged to the minority who remained true to the worship of Jehovah in the idolatrous kingdom of Israel. And, of course, they told her the wonderful story of God's dealings with the people of Israel: how He had delivered them from the bondage of Egypt, and promised always to defend and deliver those who put their trust in Him. But that thought would suggest a fresh difficulty to her mind. If God had promised to help those who prayed to Him and trusted in Him, and if He delivered her people from the slavery of Egypt, why had He not delivered her? Why had He allowed her to be torn cruelly away from all that was dear to her, and be made a slave in a foreign land, among a strange people whose language she probably could not speak, and whose worship was so false and bad? And then, again, another thought would come into her mind, all owing to her having been so well taught in the story of her race. She would remember that

God sometimes allowed some of His servants to be ill treated for wise ends of His own. She would think of Joseph, and how he, too, was taken away suddenly from his beloved home and sold into slavery in a strange land, and afterwards found out that it was, after all, for the best. So that when his brethren, who had sold him, discovered that he was the ruler of Egypt, and feared that he would punish them for the wrong they had done him, Joseph calmed their fears by telling them that God was at the bottom of it all, and had sent him to Egypt to save many lives, though his brethren had intended it for evil. That would make the little maid think that perhaps God had, after all, meant her to be taken to Damascus, as He had meant Joseph to be taken into Egypt, because He had some work for her also in the land of her captivity—some mission which He wished her to fulfil. Such would be the little maid's first temptation and the kind of thoughts that would help her to get the better of it.

Another temptation would be her beauty, for beauty is a great temptation. The possession of beauty tends more than anything else to make people vain, and vanity generally leads to a number of other sins. Not that beauty is a wrong thing in itself; it is a good thing. It is a gift from God for which those

who possess it ought to thank Him. But it is a dangerous gift, leading to many temptations. And, doubtless, the little maid felt those temptations, living as she did, a poor slave girl, among a people whose lives were not pure, and whose very religion encouraged vice and impurity. But it is plain that the little maid of Israel did not give way to the temptations to which her beauty exposed her. She evidently kept herself pure and modest, else she would not have been respected and looked up to as she was. Her modesty and purity and freedom from vanity had clearly made a deep impression in the household of her master. A slave girl who was not virtuous in an unusual degree could never have gained the influence which the little maid of Israel had won among those who came in contact with her.

Untruthfulness, we may be sure, was another temptation which sorely tried the little maid. For she was a slave, and slaves are especially exposed to that temptation. To tell a lie is the readiest weapon of the slave against those who wrong him. He cannot, as any of us might, summon the wrongdoer to a court of justice and get him punished, and thereby prevented from doing wrong again. There are no courts of justice for the slave, and he is therefore often tempted to be deceitful and get out of any

sudden difficulty by telling a lie. And so you always find that slaves and people who have been oppressed—that is, treated unjustly without any remedy—are more untruthful than those who enjoy liberty and are living under the protection of just laws. But instead of yielding to the temptation which was so natural to her lot, the little maid established a character for extraordinary truthfulness. In no other manner can we account for the way in which her words were treasured up and attended to. Just listen: "And she said unto her mistress, 'Would God my lord were with the prophet that is in Samaria; for he would recover him of his leprosy.' And one went in and told his lord, saying, 'Thus and thus said the maid that is of the land of Israel.'" See there the wonderful influence which this young slave girl got by the goodness of her character. She had resisted the temptation to be ashamed of her religion, and to try to win the favour of her master and mistress by adopting their religion. She had not become vain and conceited or impure because people admired and flattered her for her beauty. And she had not only resisted all temptations to untruthfulness, the common vice of slaves; she became so famous for her truthfulness, that whatever she said, however improbable it might seem, was believed

without a question. She spoke a few chance words to her mistress, words which perhaps she did not expect any one to give heed to; but her words were at once reported to the great Naaman, the general-in-chief of the Syrian army; and he carried them at once to the king, his master; and the king at once took the advice of the young slave girl, and sent Naaman to Samaria. Evidently she had never been known to tell a lie—a very common vice in the East among others as well as among slaves—and so the fame of her truthfulness passed even beyond the household of Naaman, and reached the palace of the king. Leprosy was considered incurable by man; and yet because the little slave girl said there was a prophet of God in Samaria (for that is the Greek translation of the passage) everybody believed that it must be so. Nobody doubted it.

Another temptation to which the little maid of Israel would be exposed was a natural feeling of resentment against her master and mistress—a feeling of revenge for the wrong they were doing her. They were evidently kind to her; but nothing can make up for the loss of liberty. The slave girl loved her home, her parents, her relatives, her friends. She loved the mountain breezes of her native land. She loved to wander, as in days gone by, on the slopes

of the hills of Samaria. And of all this happiness Naaman and his wife were robbing her. She might be excused if she felt some bitterness in her heart against them. But no; on the contrary, she desired with all her heart to do them good. Instead of feeling angry with Naaman, she took pity on him. And indeed it was a piteous case. Here was a man who had all that this world could give to make him happy. He was at the head of the army of Syria. He was a successful general and had the reputation of being a mighty man of valour. He was a favourite with his master, and was the second man in the kingdom. "But," says the story, "he was a leper." He had a foul disease which poisoned all his happiness; and the little maid pitied him, and spoke her pity in a simple pious wish that her master would go to the prophet of her God in Samaria and he would be cured. And Naaman went and was cured, not only of his leprosy, but of a worse disease—a leprosy of the soul, that is, pride and the corruptions of idolatry. Naaman was angry because the prophet of Israel did not treat him, as he thought, with sufficient respect. He thought the prophet would have come out to him, and used some grand ceremony, and spoken some fine words, to cure the leper. And because the prophet merely sent out a

message, saying, "Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thou shalt be clean," Naaman turned away in a rage, exclaiming, "Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? May I not wash in them, and be clean?" But Naaman's slaves were wiser than their master. "My father," they said, "if the prophet had bid thee do some great thing, wouldest thou not have done it? how much rather then, when he saith to thee, Wash, and be clean?" And Naaman listened to their advice, and made a journey of some thirty miles to the Jordan, and was cured of his leprosy, and converted at the same time to the worship of the true God. And all because a young slave girl of Israel made up her mind to lose no chance of doing good even to those who had done her a great wrong. And she got such an influence through the goodness of her character that people believed whatever she said. And her influence goes on still, and in lands too of which she had never heard. Here am I, nearly three thousand years after her death, preaching about her in an island of which she had never heard. She had probably never heard of Europe even, and knew very little of any lands beyond the borders of Syria and the land of Israel. She never dreamt that her words would ever be heard outside her master's household

Yet her story and her words are now known, and will be known till the end of time, in every quarter of the world. How wonderful! And what a lesson and a warning to us: a lesson to encourage us always to resist temptation, as she resisted; a warning to tell us how even chance words may have an influence far beyond our own knowledge when we speak them.

The question of mission work in foreign lands, in connection with one of our missionary societies, is brought before us to-day in this cathedral, and you are asked to help. But perhaps you think you cannot help. You are not rich, you are not powerful, you have no influence, you are but children. Yes; but think of the young slave girl of Israel. You are better off than she was. At least you are not slaves. She had no money, power, or influence from any worldly position. Yet see what she did. She cured of a dreadful disease the greatest man in Syria next to the king. And not only that, but she cured him of the worship of a false religion; and who can tell how many more in Damascus were brought, through Naaman's example, to the worship of the true God? And how did she do it? By being true to her own religion and never neglecting its duties. By never being frivolous, or vain, or conceited, or immodest on

account of her beauty. By always telling the truth whatever it might cost her. And by never letting slip a chance of being kind and good even to those who had used her cruelly. You can do all that, and you may be able, for anything you can tell, to do some great good like the little maid of Israel. You may, perhaps, be able to help missionaries in that way much more than by giving hundreds of pounds, if you could, to their funds. You can pray for the missionaries; for prayer may do more good than money. And missionaries need your prayers. It is a hard life which they are called upon to lead. They, too, are called away from home—from friends and scenes they love, perhaps never to return. And they have to endure hardship, and sometimes death, for the sake of their Master.

Take home with you, then, the story of the little maid of Israel, and try to follow her example. Never be ashamed of your religious duties. Never neglect your prayers at home or in church. Never tell an untruth, however painful the telling of the truth may be. Never cherish unkind and unforgiving feelings towards those who have been unkind or unjust to you, but, on the contrary, do them all the good you can, always remembering that in doing wrong they are harming themselves much more than

you. And when any temptation comes upon you, remember the little slave girl of Israel and be brave like her, knowing that God is always ready to help those who pray to Him and put their trust in His love.

XVI.

THE MIRACLE OF THE LOAVES.

"*When they were filled He said unto His disciples, Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost. Therefore they gathered them together, and filled twelve baskets with the fragments of the five barley loaves, which remained over and above unto them that had eaten.*"—JOHN vi. 12, 13.

No more significant act, none more pregnant with mystery, appears in the whole life of our Lord on earth than this miraculous feeding of the five thousand. And evidently that is the opinion of our Church, for she has selected it as the Gospel for the day twice in the course of the year—in the middle of Lent and now on the last Sunday in the Christian year.[1] And then again she has selected the companion miracle—the other miracle of the miraculous multiplication of loaves—for the Seventh Sunday after Trinity. It is evident therefore that our Church understands and wishes us to consider that there is

[1] Nov. 30, 1893.

a deep mystery in this miraculous multiplication of bread. Let us consider in the first place the facts, and whether we really understand their mystical significance, and in this way gather some lessons from them.

The miracle evidently produced a greater effect upon the multitude than any of the other miracles of our Lord; and this was natural, for it was exceedingly well adapted to the condition of the Jewish mind at that time. The Jews had learned from the doctors of their law that the time had almost arrived when the long-expected Messiah was due. There was thus a fermentation among the people, and the consequence was that they were only too ready sometimes to give ear to the pretensions of false Messiahs. They were thus in daily expectation of a great deliverer, another Moses who should suddenly appear, break the yoke of their oppressors, set his people free, and restore again their lost kingdom, that sacred land which God had promised to Abraham and his seed for ever. And here apparently was the leader they required. The feeder of five thousand by a mere act of will was just the captain for their need. What could resist the spirit of a nation led by one who could dispense with all the ordinary means, and miraculously feed his armies? And their mind also

reverted to the history of their race. They remembered how, when their forefathers in Egypt, oppressed under hard taskmasters, cried unto the Lord, He had sent a deliverer who subdued the great power of the Pharaoh of his time, and made a passage miraculously for His people through the Red Sea. And also they remembered that while their forefathers wandered forty years in the desert they were fed miraculously by food from heaven. Nor could they forget the promise of their great leader that one day a prophet should appear like unto him, and restore again their lost glory. Hence they thought, here was the very prophet; and after the miracle you remember they said, "This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world," namely, the prophet promised by Moses. And they were ready at once to act upon their convictions, and to proclaim our Lord by force as their King. But He eluded their importunity as He had done on other occasions by making Himself miraculously invisible. He disappeared suddenly from among them, and, as we read, went alone to a mountain, leaving His disciples to pass over to the other side of the lake. Then when darkness came He followed them, walking on the sea, and appeased their fright at His sudden apparition, bidding them not to be afraid, because it was He.

On the following day, when the multitude found where He was, they crossed the lake and asked Him for an explanation of His mysterious disappearance and reappearance. He replied by rebuking them for the carnal view which they had taken of the miracle of the loaves and of the person and mission of the Messiah. Perplexed, they asked Him what then He would have them do. He told them they were to believe in Him. That was a greater puzzle still. Why! was not that the very thing they had been doing? Had they not but yesterday attempted to give practical proof of their belief in Him when they wished to proclaim Him suddenly and by force their King? "What sign shewest Thou, that we may see and believe?" They accepted the miraculous feeding as a sign of the Messiah. "Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written, He gave them food from heaven." They, too, had just received food from heaven in the miraculous multiplication of bread, and if they were not to accept that as evidence that He was the Messiah, what other evidence was He prepared to give? Wishing still to raise their minds from carnal notions to spiritual things, He replied that it was not Moses who gave the manna, but God, Moses being only the human agent through whom God was pleased to dispense His gift. The

manna in the wilderness was but a symbol of the true bread from heaven which would feed them for ever. "Lord," they eagerly exclaimed, "evermore give us this bread." That indeed would be a sign of His Messiahship which they would joyfully accept. But they were as wide of the truth as ever, were still harping on earthly and carnal views of the Messiah and His kingdom. To startle them out of these low and earth-bound opinions Jesus proclaimed Himself to be the true bread which came down from heaven to be the food of His people for ever. This declaration at last shook them out of their traditional notions as to the person and character of the Messiah. It was a new view which they could not accept: it was too strange, entirely opposed to their experience and to the plain evidence of their senses. So they "murmured" at Him. He was talking what appeared to them to be nonsense. They knew all about Him. "Is not this," they asked, "Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" How then could He say, "I came down from heaven"? And our Lord puzzled them still further by going on to tell them that not only was He the true bread that came down from heaven, but He was unlike the manna in this, that those who partook of Him would never die. "Your fathers did

eat manna in the wilderness and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." This was the hardest saying of all. "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" they asked in astonishment, as many have asked since. But so far from explaining any part of it away, our Lord reaffirmed it with solemn emphasis: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood ye have no life in you. For My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed." That was more than most of them could bear; and we read that many of His disciples at once forsook Him and walked no more with Him. He had contradicted their reason and affronted their common sense, and they would have nothing more to say to Him.

Perhaps some of us share their difficulty. What do we understand by our Lord's words? What did He mean by calling Himself the bread of life? What sense are we to get out of His solemn and reiterated assertion that unless His people eat His flesh and drink His blood they have no life in them? We

must be careful, for He was careful, not to explain away His emphatic language. It were better to rest in ignorance, to say that the language is beyond us, that we cannot reach the height or depth of its meaning, and are therefore content to wait for further light, if He vouchsafes it, than to say with the cavilling Jews who heard Him, "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" There are many things which we are bound to believe without understanding the how or the wherefore of them. Still I think our Lord's words are susceptible of an interpretation which, while leaving the mystery of the doctrine unsolved, may enable us to get a glimpse of His meaning. He tells us that He is the bread of life, and that we must take His flesh and blood into the very substance of our humanity, else we have no life in us. Let us try to look at the matter from His point of view, which I think was something of this sort. It may be said in a sense that creation feeds upon God. That may seem a startling expression. But the fact is that human language is always an inadequate instrument for the expression of thought. It is so even in matters of this life. At best language is but the clothes of thought, never its skin; and its fitness depends on the skill of him who uses it. It is not the natural covering of thought as the skin is

the natural covering of the body, fitting it exactly, and lending itself to all its intricacies and motions. Even as regards our ideas of this world and its concerns language never expresses the exact truth; it is only an approximation to the truth, more or less exact, according to the skill of the speaker or writer. This is obviously more true in divine things. The truths of eternity are so vast, so complex, so many-sided, so mysterious, that they can never be adequately envisaged in the forms of time. If the ideas of earth can only be expressed in similitude and figure, much more the ideas of the spiritual world. We must grope after them by means of parable and metaphor. But I must warn you that in these high matters the figure is always less, not more, than the reality; the idea is larger, not smaller, than the figurative language in which it is clothed. Thus we speak of God's right hand, of His eyes, of His repenting. But in matter of fact we know that these are merely expressions thrown out at ideas which are too high for the reach of human reason and the grasp of human language. God is without parts and passions like man. He has no hands or feet like man. He never repents as man repents, for in Him there is no change of purpose; He is for ever unchangeable. But we are obliged to use these feeble instruments

of thought in order to have some apprehension of those truths of heaven and of eternity which we cannot comprehend. And in all these and like cases, remember, the thought is always greater than the figure in which it is draped. God has no hands, or feet, or eyes like man but He has attributes infinitely superior to all that those words imply in the case of man.

The next observation I have to make is that there is no kind of life independent of Almighty God; not the life of a worm, or a blade of grass, or a leaf in the forest, any more than the life of a great genius or an archangel. All life depends upon Him. Everything that lives has its root in a spiritual cause. So St. Paul tells us when he says of God that "in Him we live and move and have our being." And what the Apostle says of the human race the Psalmist affirms of all living things, as in the following passages:— "The eyes of all wait upon Thee, O Lord, and Thou givest them their meat in due season;" "The lions roaring after their prey do seek their meat from God;" "He feedeth the young ravens that call upon Him." Thus you see how vividly the inspired writers of the Bible realized the great truth, that every kind of life is derived from God and is sustained by Him; in other words, that all created life, as I have said,

feeds upon God—finds in Him its origin and continued existence. But God imparts and supports this infinitely varied life by instrumental agencies—by a great chain of secondary causes. Hardly ever does He give us any of His gifts independently and directly from Himself. "Every good gift and every perfect gift," as we are told, "is from above, and cometh down from the Father of Lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." But all these good gifts reach us, as a rule, at the end of a long chain of intermediate agencies. In dealing with His creatures, God reaches His ends by the use of means. It is so everywhere. It was so in Paradise. Man has two kinds of life, two sorts of natures, a higher and a lower nature, a spiritual life and a natural life, a life looking towards this earth and a life looking towards heaven. And each of these lives requires food suitable to it. You find evidence of this fact in the life of our first parents in Paradise. The provision made for their natural life you will find described in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis, and the 29th verse: "And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be your meat." But for the spiritual life there was

another kind of food—"the tree of life also in the midst of the garden;" a Sacramental tree, so to speak, on whose fruit the spiritual life of Adam and Eve was to feed and grow. Had they passed through their earthly probation without falling, their natural life would have developed gradually into the spiritual life; the lower nature would eventually have been shed off like the husk of the chrysalis when the life of the caterpillar has passed into the higher form of the butterfly. When man fell he forfeited his right of access to the tree of life, because his spiritual life was wounded and perverted; so that the food which was provided to nourish it became hurtful to it. The connexion of the human will with the Divine was severed, and man was banished from Paradise for his good. God is a consuming fire to the sinner—necessarily so, just as the sun in the high heavens blinds eyes not made to endure its splendour.

Man, therefore, has two natures—one material and one spiritual; and each nature needs food appropriate to itself. This is the truth of which our Lord speaks, and on which He insists in the great sacramental chapter from which our text is taken. An atmosphere of mystery pervades the whole chapter. The multiplication of the loaves was a mystery. But so is the multiplication of seed in our fields, and so also the

process by which food repairs the waste of our tissues. They are all alike things which we accept on faith without being able to get to the bottom of them. We are so accustomed to these natural processes that we forget that they are most mysterious, transcending the skill of human reason. Who can explain the wonderful process by which the foreign substances which we take into our frames are chemically transmuted into our flesh and blood? It is a mystery just as great as that by which our spiritual life is sacramentally maintained in its communion with Almighty God through the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar. Both are mysteries; both are beyond the ken of human reason; both must therefore be equally accepted by faith. But although we cannot fathom the mystery in either case, although we cannot sound its depth, I think we may get some intelligible idea of our Lord's meaning when He said that He was going to give His people His flesh and blood to eat for the nourishment of their spiritual life. Most perplexing, most mysterious; and so the Jews who listened to His discourse thought at the time. But not more perplexing or mysterious than the command, "Make the men sit down," when there were only five barley loaves to feed five thousand. Yet the disciples obeyed, and the multitude obeyed; and the miracle came

through the obedience of faith, and their hungry desires were satisfied. And so it is now and will be always. Obey Christ's command, not inquiring too curiously what it means, and you will get your reward.

When our Lord spoke of giving His flesh and blood for the food and sustenance of His people, undoubtedly He spoke in a figure. But then recollect what I have already said to you as to the significance of figurative language in describing the truths of eternity, namely, that it means more, not less, than the words convey to us in their ordinary use. Just as the "eyes of God" is an expression which implies much more than we mean by the eyes of man, so the flesh and blood of Christ mean, not less, but a great deal more than the words flesh and blood convey to us. Our flesh and blood are corruptible; His are incorruptible. Our flesh and blood belong to the plane of the natural life; His to the plane of the spiritual. By His flesh and blood He meant His Divine humanity, which is essentially spiritual. As He said Himself when the Jews carped at His words: "It is the spirit which quickeneth"—that is, maketh alive—"the flesh profiteth nothing." In one sense, indeed, it is the spirit that quickeneth even in the natural life. The material food which we take into our bodies has a

spiritual element in it, some vital principle which escapes the analysis of science and enables it to become assimilated with our substance. And this we recognize when we ask God's blessing on our daily meals.

Let us look at this a little more closely. You remember how St. Paul constantly contrasts the old man and the new, the first Adam and the second. He places them one over against the other. From both, he says, we derive life. From one a wounded and depraved life, subject to the domination of sinful desire and of death. From the other we derive spiritual life, a life rooted in Christ's incorruptible and immortal humanity; a life, therefore, with the certain promise of victory over sin and death, unless we foolishly forfeit it. With the one life we are connected by the process of natural generation from two parents; with the other, by sacramental communion through the medium of two sacraments. The one process and one connexion must be just as real as the other, else St. Paul's parallel altogether fails. Our union with the second Adam must be quite as real as our union with the first, else we have no life, no redeemed life in us. The union must, of course, be spiritual. It is so even in the case of the first Adam. The tainted nature which we derive from

him embraces our whole being. But the fact of its being spiritual does not make it less real, but more real, inasmuch as spirit is more real than matter. Hence our Lord's rebuke to the Jews when they insisted on taking a gross materialistic view of His words: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing." He came to reconstruct our fallen nature, to make it new, to place a new organic force at the centre of our being, from which a new life in union with His should develop from within, renovate the old nature from its roots, and transform it into the image of Himself. He wished therefore to remind the Jews of His day, and us through them, that He is in very truth the real underlying life of the created universe, and in a higher sense the life of the intelligent creation, of beings made in the Divine image, and endowed with immortal life. And this life must be kept alive by union with Him through the means which He has provided, especially the two great sacraments of the Gospel. For severance from Him is death, spiritual death, as certain as the death of the withered branch that is lopped off the True Vine.

XVII.

THE SIN OF WASTE.

"*When they were filled, He said unto His disciples, Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost.*"—JOHN vi. 12.

WONDERFUL words, whether you regard the occasion or the Speaker. What was the occasion? A stupendous miracle, transcending human power—the instantaneous multiplication, by a mere act of will, of a few barley loaves, so that they not only sufficed to feed a multitude of five thousand people, but left at the end of the meal fragments enough to fill twelve baskets. Such was the occasion. And the Speaker? Who was He? Had it been a poor widow who did not know how to provide for the morrow, or some wretched Lazarus lying at the gate of some rich man, in order to be fed with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table, we might understand this solicitude, this care for fragments. But it was no

poor widow who uttered the words; no helpless beggar left at some rich man's gate. The words were spoken by the Lord of the universe, by the Creator of heaven and earth, whose are "all the beasts of the forest and the cattle on a thousand hills," and who has said of Himself, "If I be hungry, I will not tell thee, for the whole world is mine, and all that therein is." They were spoken by Him, without whose sustaining power, energizing from moment to moment, the universe would collapse, and life would cease to be through all the spheres. And His power is equally manifested in all the petty operations of nature; in every leaf that flutters in the forest, in every blade of grass that grows, in every flower that blooms; in every sparrow that falls to the ground by His permission; in every ripple that plays upon the bosom of the great deep. And it was this Being, so great, so glorious, so majestic, so mysterious, so self-sufficing, who said in Judæa, more than eighteen centuries ago, "Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost;" and gave the command too at the end of a feast of His own providing without effort, and "when they were filled."

What a lesson to us against the sin of waste! And yet how seldom most of us regard waste as a sin at

all, especially if, as in this case, we are surrounded with plenty. But waste of any of God's gifts, great or small, is in His sight a sin. Our Lord's disciples might have thought: "Why gather up these fragments of bread which lie scattered among the grass? The Master has no need of them. He can work miracles and provide bread at His pleasure, without stint or effort. Why then should we trouble ourselves about fragments?" Their Master's command taught them another lesson. So now a servant may think: "My master is rich; so I need not be so very particular about his property. I need not trouble myself about fragments of time, or food, or furniture, or money. If he were a poor man it would be different. Then of course it would be wrong not to be careful about everything, even fragments. Then waste would indeed be sin. But what does it matter in the case of a rich man? He can so well afford it." Now the mistake in all this sort of reasoning is that men forget that they are stewards under one Supreme Master in heaven. And He is rich—who so rich? Yet it was He who gave the command, "Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost."

But it is not servants alone who are prone to waste: it is a sin of which we are all guilty. And the fallacy which lies at the root of it is our not

understanding that waste is a sin in itself, quite apart from the loss or gain of any one. And it is a sin in itself because all property in the world, of every kind, belongs to God, and we are accountable to Him for our use, or misuse, or neglect of it. Why was the Rich Man in the parable punished? No sin of commission is charged against him. He was rich, occupied a position of influence in society, dressed well, and kept a sumptuous table. That was all. He did not ill-use the beggar laid at his gate full of sores. He did not drive away so unsightly an object. He simply neglected him. And therefore "in Hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torment"—the torment that selfishness inevitably prepares for itself when its pampered appetites can no longer enjoy the only pleasures which they have been trained to appreciate. The Foolish Virgins, too, were shut out from the bridal feast because they had neglected to trim their lamps; and the servant who hid his talent in the earth was punished just the same as if he had made a bad use of it. And the last judicial sentence of condemnation which our Lord shall pronounce will be on those who have neglected their opportunities: "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it not to me;" and therefore "depart from me, ye cursed." And the same

doctrine is written in flaming characters on the face of nature. The organ which is not used is smitten with atrophy and perishes, and "any set of conditions which render its food and safety very easily obtained by an animal lead as a rule to degeneration."[1]

Let us consider the various ways in which we may thoughtlessly be guilty of wasting God's gifts, and let us begin with the precious gift of time. It is a gift common to all, and yet it is one of the most precious of gifts. It is a gift within reach of the humblest and poorest, and of which no one can rob them. Man may be deprived of his liberty, and thus prevented from employing his time as he would; but it is a treasure, nevertheless, of which he cannot be robbed, though his use of it may be controlled. The slave in his chains, the prisoner in his dungeon, still possesses the gift of time, and can make a good or bad use of it even under such disadvantages. The mind of man is free in all conditions of life. His body may be cribbed, cabined, confined, fettered; but his mind is eternally free. Time, however, although possessed by all, is a very precious treasure. St. Paul compares it to some valuable commodity in the market-place, which we should hasten to "redeem," or buy up, lest it should slip away from us. And the reason why

[1] Professor Ray Lankester.

time is so valuable is that it is the most fleeting of all possessions. Why are the precious metals and gems so valuable? Is it not because they are so rare? If they were as common as pebbles they would lose their value. But no gem is as rare as time, if you think of it as—what indeed it is—a succession of moments. Has it ever occurred to you that you never see the same river twice? You stand upon its bank and see it flowing past you, and it bears the same name always, and you imagine that it has always remained the same river. Think of the river Thames—how far it stretches back into the past; or of the Nile, of which we read in the earliest dawn of history. Yet they are not, in strictness of speech, two rivers, but millions of rivers, emptying themselves in quick succession into the sea. Similarly, time is a stream whose current flows more swiftly than that of any river. Yet swift as time is in its flight, a single moment of it may be charged with the destiny of a human soul. In a moment of time you may receive or give an impression which may bias a human will towards good or evil irrecoverably. A single sentence in a book, or sermon, or conversation; a passing glance at a picture; a mere look or gesture, may print an indelible impression for good or ill on the character of some man, or woman, or child, for whom Christ died. And this

bias may be so slight as to escape notice at the time, like two diverging lines, which are so near each other at the point of departure as hardly to admit the point of a needle between them, but separate gradually as they extend, till at last they stand at the opposite poles of the place from which they started. How needful, then, to pray, with the Psalmist, "Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth; keep the door of my lips;" yes, and of my eyes and ears as well. We are thus constantly giving and receiving impressions, and none of us can ever tell whether one of these impressions may not leave its mark for weal or woe eternally.

Another note of the preciousness of time is that not a moment of it can ever be recalled; once gone, it is irrecoverable; it passes into eternity with the burden of whatever we may have committed to it. You may lose the most precious of gems, and yet recover it, or buy its equivalent. But you can never recover a moment of time, or find its equivalent. For you each passing moment is unique; it has not its fellow in the wide universe. You may drop something which you value into a river, and yet find it again. It sinks, and you dive or drag the river for it; or it floats, and you overtake it and bring it to shore. But you cannot overtake the stream of time. The

present moment only is yours to profit by it. You may think that you can make up for lost or misused opportunities. But how do you know? Next moment your soul may be required of you; or the present moment may give a bias to your will which you cannot rectify. Holy Scripture and pagan philosophy agree in teaching that the development of character may reach a stage of perversion from which recovery is impossible.[1] The only thing certain about time is, that for each of us it will one day end; when we know not. To each of us a day will come when we shall know that "it is finished." Finished will then be our life here—our opportunities, our pleasures and pains, our mission; for we all have a mission, whether we know it or not. But will our work be finished? Our Saviour could bow His head upon His cross and say of the work which the Father gave Him to do, "It is finished." For He had that work always before Him. "My meat," He said, while He was fulfilling His ministry, "is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work." And therefore when His "hour" came He could face death as a conqueror and say, "It is finished." No "fragments" had been wasted in His life, none "lost."

[1] Aristotle's "Ethics," bk. ii. ch. 11, § 7; Hebrews vi. 4–6.

If we were to reckon up the time lost by the waste of fragments, we should be surprised and alarmed at the amount. It is a daily waste. Think of the time wasted by many in dressing, in reading, in praying carelessly, in lack of method, in sheer idleness of mind and body. How rare, yet how necessary, is concentration of thought. You read a book, and presently allow your thoughts to wander; your eyes skimming the pages, but your mind elsewhere. And then, when you recall your truant thoughts, you find that you are obliged to turn back several pages till you reach the point at which they strayed. The same thing happens in your prayers; yet you wonder perhaps that your prayers are not answered. The waste of time in fragments like these would probably amount, for an average Christian of middle life, to some years. Newton attributed his success as a scientific discoverer to his complete power over his thoughts, which he could concentrate, he said, on one subject for eighteen consecutive hours, if necessary. Learn then to control and concentrate your thoughts. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." Let that be your rule. Whatever you do, let it be your best. Never scamp your work; and never imagine that it is too mean and humble for your talents or ability. The excellence of your work is in

the quality of it, not in the kind, just as you judge the merits of an actor by the manner of his acting, not by the character of the part he has to play. Remember what St. Paul so often urges, namely, that the right frame of mind towards any work is to regard it as done for God; looking up from the earthly master to Him who is supreme over all. It is this spirit, and this spirit alone, which is able to produce masterpieces in art, when the artist, turning aside from all mercenary considerations, has before his mind's eye an ideal towards which he is striving—a perfection which he yearns to reach. Some of you have seen the marble figures on the roof of Milan Cathedral; and if any of you have gone up and examined them closely, you found that they were exquisitely finished in the smallest details. Yet they were intended for the eyes of passers-by, and to them they would look just as beautiful if they had been roughly finished. But the artist worked for God, or at least for his art; not for the eye or praise of man. That is the secret of all true work. In God's judgment there is as much merit in scrubbing a floor to the best of your ability as in ruling an empire to the best of your ability. It is the motive, the spirit in which work is done, that decides its character from a moral point of view. In all you put your hand to He

requires thoroughness and single-mindedness, "as seeing Him who is invisible."

On our responsibility for other gifts I need not dwell: it is obvious; such as wealth, social influence, comeliness of body, charm of manner, wit and intellectual brilliancy, any kind of accomplishment. For our use of any of these we are responsible to Almighty God. Yes, and for our use of poverty also, and sickness and sorrow. It is wonderful how much good any one can do who lives a consistent life, like the young captive maid of Israel, and throws away no chance of being useful.

And yet the lesson of the text is perhaps hardly the first lesson that the study of nature would suggest. Nature seems prodigal in her waste of beautiful and perfect things. Think of the countless seeds that perish without opportunity of developing and multiplying; of the multitudes of beautiful flowers and blossoms that one night's frost may wither; of those myriads of exquisitely fashioned insects which dance for an hour in the setting sunlight, and then cease to be; of animals and creeping things — some useless, some hurtful—which abound everywhere. Or take another class of apparent anomalies: the death of infants and—perhaps a still sorer trial of faith—the death, in the meridian of life and vigour, of men and

women who have been a blessing to their kind, and can ill be spared; of persons of warm hearts, and organizing brains, and magnetic influence, seeing the world's gallant show pass by while they lie helpless on a bed of sickness.

Reasons might be suggested for all this apparent waste, if time allowed. Suffice it now to say that in a world so full of mysteries a creature with so limited a vision as man must not assume that there are not good reasons where he sees none. An ignorant savage, who knew nothing of agriculture, would think it a senseless waste to tear up green fields and bury bread seeds in the furrows; but that was because he had no experience of golden harvests. The silkworm was doubtless considered an ugly and a useless insect until its secret was disclosed. If there be truth in that theory of development so widely accepted in our day; if one generation labours, and another enters into its labours; then we may hope that all the seeming waste in nature will one day be explained, as so many puzzles have already been explained, by a larger knowledge Then we shall know—

> "That nothing walks with aimless feet;
> That not one life shall be destroyed,
> Or cast as rubbish to the void,
> When God hath made the pile complete;

"That not a worm is cloven in vain;
That not a moth, with vain desire,
Is shrivelled in a fruitless fire,
Or but subserves another's gain."

It may be hard to see all that now. There would be no room for faith, and no incentive to progress, if there were no mysteries, no undiscovered secrets to lure us on from strength to strength, from revelation to revelation, towards

"That one far-off, divine event,
To which the whole creation moves."

It was with no doubtful purpose that the Church has given us the Gospel from which the text is taken for the last Sunday of her year. How many of us have made the best of our opportunities, how many of us have even wasted them, during the year that is now so near its close? All the more reason why we should now "gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost." If any one could afford to be careless about fragments, surely it was He who gave the command to gather them up. Yet see what a busy life He led. He was ever on the move among the towns and villages of Palestine, doing good and seeking no reward. His days were spent in ministering to the bodily and spiritual needs of "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," and His nights often on the mountain side in prayer to His Father. We

read sometimes of His spending a whole night in prayer, and sometimes of His rising before daybreak for prayer on the mountain. What a lesson to us, sinners that we are, that He, the sinless One, should work so hard in the daytime on behalf of others, and spend so much of the time, that His tired humanity needed for repose, in private supplication to His Father. Inspired by His example, then, "gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost" at least of the fraction of the year that still remains to you. Who can tell how many of us shall live to see the close of another year? But however that may be, "the time is short" even for the longest life among us; and after time comes eternity. When that hour arrives how insignificant will seem the troubles which now fret us, or the wrongs which embitter us, or the pleasures which allure us; and how precious, on the other hand, "the fragments" of good which we have "gathered up," or perhaps, alas! neglected.

XVIII.

THE DANGER OF PARTY SPIRIT.

"*And when He was come into Jerusalem all the city was moved, saying, Who is this?*"—MATT. xxi. 10.

"WHO is this?" And yet they ought not to have been so ignorant about the young Man who was thus stirring their city so profoundly. Their whole history, their prophecies, their ritual, all that marked them as a peculiar and chosen people, pointed to Him who was agitating the people of Jerusalem that day. In Him centred all their Sacred Scriptures, which were one long sigh of hope for the advent of the coming Deliverer. And yet when He appeared among them as prophecy had marked Him out, they did not know Him; they asked, with excited curiosity, "Who is this?"

Now it is easy enough to blame the Jews for the ignorance they thus displayed as to the person and

mission of their long-expected Messiah. We may think that if we had been in Jerusalem that day, with the knowledge and experience which the Jews must have had, we could not have blundered as they did, could not have failed to recognize the young Man from Nazareth, who had just entered the city from the slope of Olivet, surrounded by a rejoicing multitude, who were rending the air with their hosannas of welcome to the Son of David, now passing in triumph through David's city in the guise with which their prophecies must have made them familiar. After careful reading of the Old Testament, and regular attendance at the temple worship, we should certainly —so we may imagine—have been among those who greeted Him as the Messiah, not among those who asked, "Who is this?"

But it does not follow. Let us be just to the Jews of our Lord's time. That they might have known more about Him than they did, if they had been humble, and teachable, and pure in heart, is evident from the fact that a small minority did receive Him; not, indeed, understanding all about Him and His office at once, but having willing minds, and being therefore in a condition to receive more and more knowledge till the whole truth was revealed to them. The great fault and condemnation of the Jews of our

Lord's time was that they had *not* willing minds, that light was among them, but could not reach their minds because they closed their eyes. They allowed their prejudices to blind their reason, so that they could not see with their eyes, or hear with their ears, or understand with their hearts, and be converted and healed. All that is true. And yet something may be said on the other side to explain, though not to justify, the Jews for not recognizing their Messiah when He appeared among them. They were not altogether without excuse, though their excuse was far from sufficient. It is always a mistake to paint people blacker than the facts warrant, both because such exaggeration is pretty sure to cause a reaction to the opposite extreme, and also because we are likely to miss the lesson which the errors or misconduct of others should teach us, if we think them so exceptionally wicked that we are ourselves in no danger of following their example.

Let us see, then, what the Jews of our Lord's time might have honestly pleaded in extenuation of their guilt. The Messiah for whom they were looking was described by their prophets as a great king and conqueror, who was to deliver them from their subjection to the Gentiles, and establish a kingdom mightier and more glorious than any reign in the history of Israel.

It is true that alongside of this picture the prophets had painted another, that of a suffering Messiah—"a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," having "no form nor comeliness," "despised and rejected of men," "wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities," "oppressed and afflicted," "brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and, as a sheep before her shearers, dumb." And the sin of the Jews was that they put this picture of the Messiah away from them. It ran counter to their hopes and national vanity, and seemed to contradict the prophecies of a glorious and victorious Messiah; and therefore, instead of trying to reconcile the two sets of prophecies, they took that which pleased them, and explained the other away. That was very wrong. But was it a very uncommon fault? Are we not all prone to put away from us what we find disagreeable and painful, and to choose instead what flatters our vanity and promises to fulfil our hopes?

But there was another excuse which the Jews might urge in self-defence, even more plausible than this about the two Messiahs. Their prophecies had plainly said that the Messiah would be a descendant of David, and would be born in David's native town, Bethlehem. Jesus fulfilled these prophecies literally. He was descended from David, according to the flesh,

and He was born in Bethlehem. But see how circumstances conspired to conceal these facts from the Jews. He was born in Bethlehem accidentally, as we should say, but did not live there. He was carried as an infant hurriedly into Egypt to escape Herod's massacre of the infants of Bethlehem; and when He returned to Palestine it was not in Bethlehem, but in Nazareth, that Joseph and Mary made their home. It is true that if the Jews had not allowed their minds to be perverted by prejudices they might have remembered a prophecy which said, "Out of Egypt have I called my son," and another which said, "He shall be called a Nazarene." But the applicability of these two prophecies to the Messiah was not obvious before the event; and I doubt if any of us would recognize the reference it we had not the authority of the Evangelist for it. You remember the Pharisees' retort on Nicodemus, when he pleaded in the Sanhedrim for a patient inquiry into the claims of Christ: "Art thou also a Galilean? Search and look: for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet."[1] That was an honest prejudice; not extemporized for the occasion, but rooted in the traditions and inveterate belief of the nation. Even Nathanael, whom our Lord called "an Israelite indeed,

[1] John vii. 51, 52.

in whom there is no guile," refused at first to acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah on this very ground. When urged by Philip, he asked incredulously, "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?"[1] But, unlike the mass of his countrymen, when pressed to "come and see," he went with a sincere mind, and was convinced. If the Jews in general had acted like this Israelite without guile, doubtless their prejudices too would have vanished, and they would have had no need to ask on Palm Sunday, "Who is this?" But before we condemn them, let us be sure that we should have acted differently in their circumstances. The behaviour of the Jews towards our Lord was not an exception to the general rule in such cases; it was an example of the general rule. It was the recognition of Him by the few which was exceptional. "A prophet has no honour in his own country" is the proverbial experience of mankind, and our Lord quoted the proverb to show that He recognized its truth. The rule of the multitude has been to reject its Messiah, to denounce and persecute the prophet whose tomb a future generation will adorn. The claim of Christ to be the Messiah shocked His generation. What! a Galilean, a carpenter's son (as they believed), himself too a carpenter, poorly clad,

[1] John i. 46.

and speaking with a Galilean accent—*this* the great Deliverer, of whom prophets foretold and psalmists sang! Impossible! Very foolish of them to argue thus; very shallow and short-sighted. Certainly; but should we have acted differently? That is the question which we have to consider. And we can easily test ourselves. Those who recognized our Lord in spite of their traditional prejudices were persons of the Nathanael spirit—Israelites without guile; the humble, the meek, the pure in heart, the peacemakers, the hungerers after righteousness. They knew Him and clung to Him, and forsook all to follow Him. Their understanding might be at fault, but their hearts were true; and, not with the intellect, but "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness."

Now our Lord Himself tells us that the true test of how we should have behaved towards Him is our behaviour in the similar circumstances of our own time. He did not move in the ordinary grooves of Jewish thought and feeling. He took a line of His own. He cut across the prejudices of His generation and rejected "the traditions of the elders." He had no respect of persons. He was utterly unconventional, and denounced evil doers with impartial severity, irrespective of their rank. He was an innovator, regarding the spirit of a command or principle more

than the letter, daring on the Sabbath day to heal the afflicted, and proclaiming audaciously that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." He was therefore looked upon as a revolutionist.

Such was the Jewish attitude of mind towards their Messiah. What is our attitude towards our Messiahs—towards those who offer to us truths which are unfamiliar, or unpalatable, or which we may consider dangerous? The Jews thought our Lord's teaching most dangerous, most anarchical, utterly ruinous to the institutions of the country, and undermining the foundations of the whole Mosaic dispensation. They were perfectly sincere; yet they were guilty. For they might have known better if they had taken the trouble to learn; if they had kept a candid mind, like Nathanael, and examined our Lord's claims on their merits, and not through the haze of traditional prejudices. Are we better? Are we never swayed by party considerations, religious or political, in our reception of new doctrines or policies? What is our first question on such occasions? Is it whether the doctrine or policy is true and beneficial? Is it not rather this? How will it affect me—my position, my interests, my privileges, my class, my party? If so, we are actuated by the spirit which moved the

Jews to reject their Messiah; and had we lived in Judæa then we should have been on their side.

Suppose our Lord were to appear now in London as He appeared in Judæa—that is, in disguise—do you suppose that His reception would be very different? Imagine Him in Hyde Park, or in one of our fashionable places of public resort, preaching the doctrines which He preached on the mount, or in synagogue and temple; lashing the avaricious, the luxurious, the hypocrites of various kinds, the Scribes and Pharisees who "despised others" and "thanked God that they were not as other men are," the devourers of widows' houses, the corrupters of children, those who insist on the letter of law and privilege while disregarding its spirit. Would He not be received very much as He was received in Jerusalem? Not arrayed, indeed, in purple robe, and spat upon, and buffeted, and crucified. We are grown too refined for such barbarities. But think of the articles which would appear against Him in some of our leading newspapers, the caricatures that would be drawn of Him, the contemptuous or indignant references that would be made to Him in speeches and sermons, the cold shoulder which society generally would present to Him. Ah! my friends, the world has not greatly changed since the Son of

Man appeared in Judæa and the people of Jerusalem —some in curiosity, some in scorn—asked, "Who is this?" Now, as of old, only the few would recognize Him; those who are, in their measure and degree living His life of purity, unselfishness, humility, charity, detachment from the world.

"Who is this?" It is a momentous question still. The Jews found it so. It haunted them. They could not get away from it. For Christ is one of those regal personalities about whom men cannot be indifferent. We observe such persons on the page of history. They may be good or bad, but they challenge attention. They are men to be reckoned with. They attract or they repel; they are loved or they are hated; but they cannot be ignored. Our Lord was of that character, though in a higher degree than any mere man. Men were bound to have an opinion about Him. They might recognize Him as Incarnate God, or as the agent of Beelzebub; but they were constrained to take a side for or against Him. Invariably He attracted or repelled. He repelled the devils, for they "knew Him," and cried out in pain when He approached them. He repelled all who were of the devilish character. To the Jews, who called Him a devil, He said, "Ye are of your father, the devil." Those who were not with

Him were of necessity against Him. Indifferent towards Him no one could be.

Let us then ask ourselves, in a reverent temper, "Who is this?" What are the claims which He makes on our faith and allegiance? No ordinary claims certainly. They are claims which place Him in a category altogether different from all other teachers of mankind. He stands apart. Take all the great teachers and founders of systems and religions: Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, among philosophers; Sakya-Muni, Confucius, Mohammed — the founders of the great religions of the world outside Christendom. What do they say about themselves? What claims do they make? They all own themselves to be sinners and ordinary mortals. They arrogate no unique distinction.

Christ makes no such admission, and He does claim a unique position among men, a claim which would be arrogant and presumptuous in the highest degree, if not well founded. Never once does He place Himself on the level of ordinary humanity. He assumes prerogatives which separate Him by an impassable gulf from all men that have been born. He calls Himself "the light of the world;" *not* a mere channel or medium of light, but light itself, light in its essence, the primal source of moral,

material, and intellectual light. He claims also to be "the way," "the truth," "the life;" not the mere giver of life; not the mere teacher of truth; not the mere guide of the wayfarer: but the way itself, the truth itself, the life itself. And so, in another place, He calls Himself "the resurrection and the life;" not the riser from the dead, or the raiser of the dead, but the resurrection itself, the organic cause of life from the dead, the resurrection in such sense that, because He lives, those who believe on Him and are united with Him cannot die. To be a partaker of His nature therefore is to be partaker of eternal life.

Of such a kind are the claims which Christ makes for Himself; and the claims are more than justified in the biographies which we have of Him. There are four of them, and in none of those portraits is it possible to detect a flaw. Of no other biography can that be said. We have biographies of other teachers and leaders of men—we have more than one biographical portrait of Socrates—but not one of them all shows a flawless character. What is the inference? The necessary inference is, that if Christ is not what He claims to be—perfect man, yet more than man—the four Gospels are nothing less than four miracles. That four men, of no remarkable genius and little learning, and writing independently of each other,

should have succeeded in painting a perfectly flawless character, would itself be a fact unique in history. If those four portraits are not a faithful copy of the original, it would have required a miracle to imagine one of them, let alone four. The picture which we have of our Lord in the four Gospels is one of ideal perfection, perfectly consistent in all its parts. Either it is the transcript of a perfect character, or it is a miracle.

Then, again, you will find that He escaped all the racial and national characteristics of His environment. He lived at the meeting-point of the three great races of His time—the Jew, the Greek, the Roman. We know what a persistent type the Jewish is. Our Lord shows not a trace of it, or of the Greek or Roman type either. He is without the prejudices or peculiarities of any race or class. Translate His doctrine into any language, and you will find that it is suited to that people. He is thus a Pattern Man, an ideal Representative of our race, summing up in Himself the perfections of our nature in its totality, without distinction of race or sex.

To-day is Advent Sunday, the first Sunday of the Christian year; and the Church gives us for meditation the thoughts suggested by the two Advents of our Lord: His first "in great humility;" His second

when He shall appear to judge mankind. But, in matter of fact, He is always judging us, and the last great Judgment is but the crisis of a continual process now going on. We are ourselves daily recording the materials of our doom. In fact, the word "crisis" is simply the Greek word for judgment written in English letters; and it means a division. There will one day be a twofold division—the instantaneous sifting of the evidence, as in the Parable of the Wedding Garment, and the division of the sheep from the goats. Here good and evil are intermingled: then there will be a crisis, a division, a cleaving asunder of mankind by the force of a moral attraction, when they shall go, each "to his own place." Now is the time to make our choice. It will be too late then to ask, "Who is this?" too late when the great white throne is set and the books are opened, and the sentence has gone forth in the sight and hearing of heaven, "Give an account of thy stewardship, for thou must be no longer steward."

XIX.

CAPITAL AND LABOUR.[1]

"*See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil.*"—EPH. v. 15, 16.

"BECAUSE the days are evil." Evil undoubtedly they were when the Apostle wrote these words. It is difficult, indeed impossible, for Christians now to realize the moral condition of the Pagan world in the dawn of Christianity. Selfishness was the supreme rule of human conduct. Might was right. The moral law had little or no force in the mutual relations of nations, of tribes, or even of families. Slavery was universal. The industrial classes, as we understand the expression, did not exist in the world of Paganism. The workmen were slaves who were absolutely at the mercy of their masters. And in addition to slavery there was an even greater evil—

[1] Preached in Ripon Cathedral during the Coal Strike of 1893.

the degradation of women; an even greater evil, because civilization can more easily co-exist with slavery than with the denial to woman of her rightful and providential position as man's helpmate. Poverty, too, was rife to an extent unknown even in our great cities. Yet poverty was not recognized as a thing which had any claim on the benevolence or justice either of the State or of individuals. Not until the reign of the first Christian emperor had the poor, as such, any recognized position in the Roman empire. There was no provision for the helpless; no hospitals for incurables or the insane. Then consider the awful waste of human life—the reckless way in which multitudes of human lives were sacrificed "to make a Roman holiday." And over all these evils hung the terrible pall of a gloomy hopelessness. To the heathen, even the most enlightened, death was a frightful spectre, a skeleton poisoning their feasts. The future was to them all dark. They had at best only individual opinions and vague guesses on the subject. They knew nothing about it for certain. But all this is changed. We live in the nineteenth century—in the light of Christianity and of that modern civilization which is the product of Christianity. The kingdoms of this world have in a sense—a very real sense—become the kingdoms of

our Lord and of His Christ. The governing and progressive nations of the earth do homage to the name of Christ, yield allegiance to His religion, and profess obedience to His law. Can, then, the exhortation of the text apply to us? Are we, too, bound to "walk circumspectly," "redeeming the time, because the days are evil"?

Are our days evil? I do not mean evil in the sense of such misfortunes as belong to man's condition in this world, and over which he has no control, such as death, and sorrow, and bodily ills beyond man's power to prevent or remedy. I mean ills which might be avoided by "walking circumspectly" and "redeeming the time" by a diligent use of our opportunities. Take, for instance, the struggle which has been going on at intervals for a generation — the struggle between labour and capital. Is it not a disgrace to our civilization, to our Christianity, that such a struggle should have been allowed to last so long? There are doubtless, as in most quarrels, faults on both sides. But who is to distribute the blame in equitable proportions? For that an impartial tribunal is necessary, and there is a general call for a Court of Arbitration. But what is to be the constitution of such a court, and what are to be its powers? Is it to be optional on both parties to

appear before it? In that case it would probably have very little to do, unless a great change should pass over the spirit of the contending forces. But is public opinion ripe for the establishment of a tribunal which, like the Irish Land Courts, would have power, on appeal from either side, or of its own initiative, to adjudicate in every case between labour and capital? That would mean, of course, free access to the books of the employers without any restriction as to the method of computing a fair average of profit and wages. There would have also to be a clear understanding about what is called "a living wage." Putting aside the ambiguity of the phrase—for what may seem "a living wage" to one man may seem something very different to another—it is surely no part of the employer's duty to provide "a living wage." Something, indeed, may be said as to the obligation of the State to supply the necessaries of life to all its citizens—an obligation recognized by English law, however imperfectly fulfilled. But to impose on the employer a legal obligation to provide "a living wage" for the employed, regardless of questions of profit and loss, would be gross tyranny, and would deal a death-blow to industry. A fair wage is another matter. A court that both parties would accept would be of inestimable value both to employers

and employed. It might make mistakes occasionally, for no tribunal can be infallible. But it would be impartial, and the saving to both sides in the long run would be enormous. Think of the millions of money which have been wasted by the present system of strikes and lock-outs, to say nothing of the misery, the cruelty, the ruin to multitudes of people which have been its direct results. And its indirect effects are hardly less disastrous, for it is not only the employers and employed who suffer, nor yet only the consumers. The general public suffer through enhanced prices and the dislocation of trade.

Surely here is a call upon all of us to "redeem the time because the days are evil," to make up for lost opportunities by more earnest endeavours in the present and the future. Nor let any be discouraged by the thought that they are too few or humble to have any influence on so great an issue. The secret power of personal influence is immeasurable. None of us can tell how far our personal influence may extend, how deep it may penetrate. You drop a pebble into a still pool, and you see it form a circle, which gradually extends till it fades from your vision, but from your vision only. It still goes on widening, though you no longer see it. And so true is this, that it is a well-known fact in mathematical science that

if you were to drop a stone in mid-ocean when it is agitated by a tempest it would make a circle which, in spite of intervening waves, would go on enlarging its circumference till its progress was arrested by the shore. So mysterious, though invisible, may be the ever-widening sphere of personal influence, even of the poorest and humblest. And certainly there is one potent instrument of influence which the humblest possesses in common with the most exalted —the efficacy of prayer. To how many of us has it ever occurred that prayer has any bearing at all on such matters? How do we know that the fervent prayers of such a congregation as I see before me might not have the effect of bringing both parties in this dispute to a better mind, so that they might understand each other, and compose their differences? A resort to prayer would have been the first impulse of the early Christians in all their difficulties. Good reason, then, have we to redeem the time, considering our neglect in this most important department of the spiritual life.

Various causes may be assigned for this strife between labour and capital; but one obvious cause is the rapid means of communication which exists now, in contrast with former times, between the working classes, not only in this country, but all the world

over. This gives the working classes of our day a power of combined action which their sires did not possess. Now they can face their employers on equal terms; and no fair-minded man can deny that this union of the working classes has, speaking generally, extorted from their masters a fairer treatment than the pleadings of reason and justice could of themselves have obtained. It is bad for any man, and for any class of men, to possess irresponsible power; bad for any one to be sole judge in his own cause. But the working classes have now got the strength of a giant, and they are naturally exposed to the temptation of using their strength like a giant, pushing their advantage to the opposite extreme. Let us, however, be just to them. Let us remember that the State—that is, the citizens at large in their legislative capacity—is mainly responsible for much of the discontent and unrest of the working classes. For more than twenty years we have not only placed education within the reach of the poorest, but we have made it compulsory on them. A new generation has grown up with larger ideas, larger hopes, loftier aims, ambitions undreamt of before. That is the inevitable result of education. It opens the mind. It elevates the vision. It creates fresh desires. But while the working classes have thus been forced to expand their

mental faculties and extend their horizon, their social condition has remained almost unchanged. Their new-born desires remain unsatisfied. The many see the few in the enjoyment of the good things of this life, which to them are but the gilding of sunlight on inaccessible mountain peaks. Is it surprising that they should be tempted to feel envious and claim some share of these good things—shorter hours of labour, for example, for the recreation of their minds as well as the refreshment of their bodies? Let us be just. We have created those desires in their breasts by educating them in advance of their former condition. I am far from saying that we have made a mistake in this respect. What I say is that we have not gone far enough—that we are bound, even in self-defence, to go farther. A State which compels all the citizens, even the poorest, to be educated, is surely bound by the law of self-preservation to do all that is possible, within the limits of reason and justice, to satisfy their demands and aspirations, and to see that the enlightenment of the intellect is tempered by the ideas, principles, spirit, and ideals of Christianity. We have done something in this direction, but much remains to be done. We are enlightening the minds of the working classes. What are we doing to purify their hearts, to subdue their passions,

to control their wayward wills? We have practically abolished Christian education from State schools. For a Christian education, from which creeds and dogmas are expelled, is a contradiction in terms and an absurdity. An education which is not distinctive of any religion is not a religious education. And it is an impossibility in addition, as a little reflection will show. It is hardly possible to devise any system of religious education which is not distinctive of some denomination. Forbid the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, and your religious instruction will become Unitarian. Forbid the Unitarian creed, and your religious education will become either Agnostic or Atheistic. I see no solution short of a purely secular education in State schools, coupled with facilities for religious teaching supplied by Church and Nonconformists under the protection of the conscience clause. I would exclude no denomination, whatever its creed, from the benefit of this scheme. In the present state of feeling, I see no possibility for any other compromises.

But I may be told that the Sermon on the Mount contains the most elevated morality, and that it can be taught and expounded without the help of any creed. Can it? Let us see. Let me say, in the first place, that the morality of the Sermon on the Mount

was, in substance, taught outside the pale of Christianity—by writers like Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, and others. The unique distinction between Christ and other teachers was not so much in the difference of the morality which they taught respectively as in the authority and the power of the teacher. "He taught as one having authority, and not as the Scribes," as even His adversaries admitted. Other teachers uttered opinions with no sanction behind to enforce them. He taught truths with the authority of one who claimed to be Himself the Truth. Above all, other teachers could only exhort; they could give no power to enable their disciples to practise the morality which the teacher taught. He not only taught with authority: He offered the strength which would enable His followers to do His will. And all this because He was God as well as Man. But that is a truth which must not be taught in the State schools. Suppose a teacher is expounding the Sermon on the Mount to his class, and one of them asks who the Preacher was, who Jesus of Nazareth was, what is the teacher to do? He must avoid the doctrine of the Incarnation, and must either refuse to answer at all, or say that Jesus was the Son of Mary. If he says of Joseph also, he denies an article of the Christian faith. If he only mentions Christ's mother, he is teaching a

half-truth only, which is the most dangerous form of error. Christianity and philosophy agree in teaching that the true end of education is not to sharpen the intellect merely, but to elevate the whole man—to enlighten his conscience and enable his will to resist temptation. And no one has insisted on that truth more emphatically than the eminent Agnostic leader, Mr. Herbert Spencer, enlightenment of the intellect alone being, in his opinion, not useless merely, but mischievous in addition. Man was not born into this world for the purpose of getting on in material prosperity. He was born for the purpose of developing his nature heavenwards—developing it, that is, to the highest perfection possible for it. And wealth and comfort, which so many aim at, are no necessary factors in that development. Now is it not true that through our one-sided system of education the working men of our country are losing their sense of the dignity of labour? Is it not a common complaint that work of all kinds is deteriorating in quality? The workman no longer takes pride, as of old, in his work. He does not put his best into it—his best talent, his best skill. Work is too commonly scamped. But before we condemn workmen indiscriminately, let us consider whether those who sometimes call themselves their betters have not set them the

example. Do we not hear of shoddy on the part of the manufacturer, and of adulteration in trade? What is needful is to press upon all that this degradation of labour, this feverish haste to get rich, is not an admirable, but is an ignoble thing. We have, it seems, to teach anew the lesson of the Incarnation; to set before men the example of One, the Eternal God and the Lord of the universe, who, though He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we through His poverty might be rich: One who lived on earth the life of a carpenter, and cared not for any higher position in society, and whose public ministry was devoted to the welfare, bodily and spiritual, of the people. The vision of such a One, if we could but realize it, would show the utter insignificance of the part which man plays on the stage of this world's theatre as compared with the manner in which he plays his part; just as the excellence of an actor in an ordinary theatre does not depend on the part assigned to him, but on his manner of acting it. Some of us may remember in our youth a play in which a mere subordinate part was raised to be the chief part in the play by the admirable acting of the man who played it.

Let me give a striking illustration of what education without Christianity logically leads to. The

organ of the Social Democrats in Berlin, before Prince Bismarck suppressed it, published a telling article on the relations of labour and capital, of which the following extract will show the drift:—

"They who take heaven from the people must give them the earth. When the priesthood bowed the neck of mankind, it gave to the suffering son of man the kindly hope of another and a better world. In all the misfortunes of life, in sorrow, need, and sickness, a sweet hope was still left to a believing mind. But what is now the case? There are still poverty and privation, sorrow, need, and sickness. These are artificially enhanced and heaped up upon one class, while the pleasures and good things of the world combine to enrich the other. What, then, have the favoured of human society to offer to those millions, through whose sickness, increased by poverty and care, they enjoy the pleasures of earth? We tolerate no halfness and no expedients; we desire the full results, the whole truth. Ye wretched Pharisees of free Churches, of liberal citizenship, who have deprived the people of the consolations of faith, and yet will not remove from them the iron yoke of your iron machines, where, then, is your logic? The logic of history is sterner than yours: the people have done with heaven, and they are justified in claiming the earth."

That is a dilemma not easily answered by those who desire to expel all definite Christianity from the schools. I say "definite Christianity," because a Christianity which is not definite is a delusion. It is intended to mean Christian morality without

Christian belief, which is as impossible as fruit from a tree which has been severed from its roots. Its logical outcome is the doctrine propounded so frankly in the extract which I have quoted from the *Social Democrat* of Berlin. In our own country the working-class vote, if cast solidly, would overwhelm all other classes of the community. Our working classes are still Christian in the main, and have never, to their great honour, combined for the purpose of dispossessing other classes of their legitimate rights. But let a generation arise which has cast off Christianity, and then what inducement will the working classes have to respect the present order of things? It would be vain to try to restrain them by arguments from political economy. An empty stomach or covetous heart will pay little heed to the demonstrations of political economy.

But true as all this is, it is right to add that the State may still do much towards bettering the temporal condition of those whom it has compelled to be educated. One of our most serious dangers arises from the fact that the great mass of the people have been divorced from the land; partly, no doubt, owing to economic causes which could not have been avoided; but partly also due to the passion—not wrong in itself—among men of wealth to acquire

landed property, and add acre to acre. Where are now the "Statesmen"—those sturdy yeomen who owned and tilled their own lands in the vales and on the hillsides of Cumberland? Where are the multitudes of like yeomen scattered all over the country? They are almost all extinct; and with them has passed away a truly conservative element—I do not use the word in any party sense—in our political system.

Now this separation of the people from the land is a very serious matter. For you must bear in mind that we have in this country a state of things politically which exists nowhere else, and never has existed. The vast majority of those who vote for members of Parliament belong to the wage-earning class; in other words, those to whom we have granted the power of making our laws have no property in the soil. And until quite lately they had no voice in the administration of affairs. We have begun to remedy this; first, in the Local Government Act, and now in the forthcoming Parish Councils Bill, and the Bill for the easy acquisition of allotments by working men, whether as individuals or as village communes. A powerful attraction is needed to restore to their villages the masses of people who have forsaken rural for town life. Village life has become very dull.

England is rapidly ceasing to be "Merry England." Let us try whether we cannot do something to make village life more attractive by giving the rural population some interest in civic life. Give them a share in the work of the State, and they will feel that there is an honour and a dignity in the life of a villager. Let the villager associate with the squire and the parson, not only as a labourer, but also as a man who takes his share with them in affairs of State, and see whether it will not in course of time invest life with a fresh interest for him, and with that interest the sense of responsibility which acquired privileges are apt to engender.

I have often thought that the remarkable and singularly sagacious legislation of the Mosaic Dispensation on the subject of land tenure and repayment of debts was one of the strongest arguments both for the Divine inspiration of the Pentateuch and for its Mosaic authorship. The twentieth chapter of Leviticus, especially its system of land tenure, must have been written before the Israelites took possession of Canaan. In the jubilee year, that is, every fiftieth year, all land in Canaan was to return to its original owner or his legal successor. That law was evidently made before the Israelites got possession of the land. So "stiff-necked" a race would not have submitted

to it after possession. A universal confiscation of the land for the purpose of its redistribution on an entirely novel principle would have been a revolution requiring overwhelming force to carry it out and maintain it until public opinion was being enlisted in its favour; and that would certainly mean a period of not less than a generation. If there had been any such agrarian revolution we should undoubtedly have heard of it. Yet there is not a hint or echo of anything of the kind in the Old Testament, or in Josephus or any other Jewish writer. This seems to me to fix the date of the Pentateuch beyond any reasonable doubt. The law of the jubilee year must have been ordained before the Israelites took possession of the Holy Land. It would not have been accepted later; nor could it be a literary forgery which had no practical significance—a counsel of perfection not intended for use. On the contrary, it was imbedded in the very core of the Jewish polity, and was faithfully obeyed. Evidence of this kind seems to me much more cogent and trustworthy than sweeping generalizations from literary theories and linguistic analogies and discrepancies—a species of reasoning which can never be decisive, and is often as fallacious in its methods as it is untrustworthy in its assumptions. But a fact like the jubilee year land tenure

appeals to the reason and common sense of all. How is it to be accounted for if the Pentateuch is of a later date than the Hebrew invasion of Canaan?

And how shall we explain this land system if we reject Divine guidance? I do not mean, of course, that no man could have thought of it. But is it likely? It is, as far as I know, original and unique. The Israelites had no experience of anything like it in Egypt. Their polity bears traces of Egyptian influences in other matters; none here. On one point at least the Hebrew lawgiver has proved himself a better statesman and social reformer than any that went before or has come after him. Agrarian troubles have been a marked feature in the history of all States. They played an important part in the history of the Greek States, and still more in the history of Rome. In modern times not a State in Europe has escaped them. The tenure, distribution, privileges, and liabilities of landed property are at this moment the most difficult problem in English politics, and have always been at the root of our troubles in Ireland. But while other States have been struggling to solve this problem by various methods of reform, the Hebrew legislator foresaw the difficulty and met it beforehand by means of a self-acting law which made abuses impossible—at least for more than

a very limited time. He effected by a wonderful foresight what other statesmen, ancient and modern, have achieved by revolution. The Israelite could sell his land, but for a limited period only. At the end of half a century it returned to the original owner or his successor. No property therefore could be alienated permanently from the old family. At the end of fifty years "every man returned to his possessions." The result was to prevent monopoly of the land and the accumulation of large estates. We learn from the Hebrew prophets that the desire to "lay field to field till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth," was as keen among the Jews as among other people. But the law of the jubilee year must have acted as a serious and salutary check. There would be less temptation to add field to field when possession was only temporary. And while no family could grow very rich on the land alone, no family could, on the other hand, be reduced to beggary. It was also a merciful and compassionate law, for the father could not ruin the son by misconduct or extravagance; nor could the son burden the property beyond his own lifetime. As the population multiplied, the younger members of the family would be obliged to seek a livelihood away from the ancestral property, and even from the confines of the Holy Land.

But the law of the jubilee year secured a resident and prosperous population in Palestine. And another law made provision against the impoverishment of the land by overcropping, the law, namely, which ordained "a Sabbath of rest unto the land" every seventh year —a provision which some agriculturists of our own time have recommended. Every seventh year, too, all slaves were to be set free, and all debts cancelled— the latter of which has in principle been adopted into our own law.

We have yet, it seems, a good deal to learn from the Old Book, and in no way more than in our dealing with our labouring population. We cannot introduce the law of the jubilee year, but we may act in its spirit. We ought to aim at restoring the people to the land, in some proportion at least to their stake in it in past times; an achievement surely to which the resources of statesmanship ought to be equal. We call on every able-bodied man to risk limb and life in defence of his country in case of need. Ought it not to be our endeavour to stimulate his patriotism by making him feel that he has individually a stake in the country, which makes it worth his while to risk his life in its defence? Our working classes have hitherto shown great moderation and good sense in their demands; and their hostile attitude towards all

forms of anarchical principles and practices has been satisfactorily demonstrated. Let us be patient with their aspirations and demands, even when they seem to us perchance wild and impracticable. The good sense of the mass will, I believe, suffice to keep the enthusiasm or folly of the wrong-headed within bounds.[1]

[1] Since these words were spoken the Labour Congress has passed a resolution in favour of the nationalization of land and other articles of the Collectivist creed. It is no secret that some of the most respected labour leaders disapproved of this resolution, though they voted for it as a counsel of perfection, and in order to prevent extreme and reckless advisers of the working classes from gaining influence. A mistaken policy surely. The programme of Collectivism could only be carried by a violent revolution, compared with which that under Cromwell was child's play. And meanwhile practicable legislation on behalf of the labouring classes would be postponed indefinitely. The degree in which our modern socialists are prepared to allow crude theories to override common sense is illustrated in a letter signed "F. E. B." in the *Spectator* of November 3rd this year. The writer actually argues that the physically feeble and mentally stupid should be paid equally with the strong in body and mind, on the ground that it is all a matter of heredity, and therefore not of merit. The editor points out that by a parity of reasoning "the constitutionally indolent ought to be paid as good wages as the constitutionally industrious." He might have added lunatics, imbeciles, and dipsomaniacs. "F. E. B." thinks that his theory is "something like the ideal found in the teaching of Christ." On the contrary, Christ was very careful to guard His teaching from the danger of being mixed up with political theories or legislative programmes. He explicitly declined, when appealed to, to be a divider of property between contending claimants. Doubtless He would have approved of the man of strong body and brilliant mind sharing his gains with "the feeble in limb and slow of thought." But where is there a hint of His encouraging a cast-iron system of

But while patient, even with the errors of the suffering masses, let us be impatient with everything that hinders, or unnecessarily delays, the bettering of their condition. For each of us "the night cometh when no one can work." Therefore use the moments as they fly.

The text implies that time is a valuable commodity which is slipping rapidly away, and which we must therefore hasten to buy up. Yet how seldom we think that time is something substantial which we are wasting. Yet so it is. Think what can be done in any given portion of time, say a day; and take a lesson from the energy of God in Nature. "My Father worketh hitherto," said Jesus, "and I work." Nature is never still. Go out into the fields when there is no sound in the silent air, and not a breath of wind to stir the leaves in the woods. But if you had eyes to see beneath the surface, and ears to hear the secrets of Nature, you would find that there was a ceaseless rush and flow of energy—sap rushing through blade and stem, and countless earthworms ploughing the soil to fit it for the husbandry of man. Our own bodies, too, are in perpetual motion, and if the heart

equality by legislation? His aim was to foster a spirit which would end in making men independent of law by making each a law unto himself. The Parable of the Talents alone shows how entirely "F. E. B." has misunderstood the drift of Christ's teaching. The larger talent received the larger reward.

were to stop its ceaseless beating but for a few moments, life would become extinct. Consider also the silent majestic energy of the laws which hold the universe together. Were that energy to cease for a single second, there would be a crash of worlds and a universal silence of the spheres. In heaven, too, there is endless energy. "They rest not day nor night." It is a life of unwearying, toilless activity; ever working, yet never exhausted. Then reflect that every hour of time may be pregnant with the destiny of a continent. In a single hour some great man—a statesman, orator, poet, general, artist—may be born who will shape the history of a nation—yes, of many nations. The hour in which Napoleon, in which Wellington, was born was pregnant with the destiny of Europe. Think again of the bias, for good or ill, which may in a moment be given to a fellow-creature's will—by a word, a look, a gesture. Time is passing momentarily into the irrevocable past, but it projects its effects forward into the future to meet us at the great day of doom. Time goes, but its fleeting moments leave their impress—perhaps their indelible impress—on the character and destiny of every one of us. Awful thought! Let us then take heed to the Apostle's words: "See that ye walk circumspectly; not as fools, but as wise; redeeming the time, because the days are evil."

XX.

THE DOCTRINE OF FORGIVENESS AS TAUGHT BY CHRIST.

"*Then came Peter to Him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times; but, Until seventy times seven.*"—MATT. xviii. 21–22.

THE key to the interpretation of St. Peter's question and our Lord's answer, with its illustrative parable which followed, is to be found in the first part of the chapter from which the text is taken. Our Lord had been speaking on the duty of dealing tenderly with the little ones of His Kingdom, and was thus led on to treat of the manner in which His disciples were to conduct themselves towards those who had trespassed, or would trespass against them. Then He laid down this general rule: "Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he shall

hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. But if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." It is exceedingly noteworthy that in the rule laid down here by our Lord, the responsibility of seeking reconciliation is laid primarily, not upon the man who has done wrong, but upon the man who has received the wrong. It is the injured man who is to take the initiative, to go after the offender, to seek him out, and to exhaust all proper means of bringing him to a right state of mind, and of getting him reconciled to the man whom he has wronged. It is only after all these proper means have been exhausted, after the man who has been injured has done everything in his power—a great deal more than the law prescribed—it is then only that he is to regard the offender as "a heathen man and a publican." Is not this the exact opposite to the world's code of morality upon that subject? Is it not the rule among men of the world—I do not use the word in a bad sense—is it not the rule among Christian men of the world, who live what we should call on the whole good honest lives, to wait until the

offender has come to them with a confession and an apology? And if they then accept the apology and forgive the offence, they probably think they have done something very magnanimous; nor would they consider they had done anything very much amiss if they refused to accept the apology, especially if the offence had been a gross one. If the offender did not apologize, even an otherwise good Christian would probably think that he might treat the matter with indifference, take no notice of it, and say to himself, "He has offended me, I will take no notice, I will leave him to himself." Would not men of the world —Christian men—consider that they had upon the whole discharged the Christian duty of forgiveness if they treated the offender in that way? But the law which our Lord laid down in His answer to Peter, which governed His own conduct, the law which rules the dealing of Almighty God with sinful man, is that the man who has been injured, to whom the wrong has been done, is to make the first move, is to take the first step, is to go after the man who has done the wrong, and use his utmost means of persuasion to convince him of his guilt and to bring him back from the error of his ways.

That is the Divine law of forgiveness, and it cuts very deep. It startled St. Peter and prompted him

to ask the question in the text: "How oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times?" It was probably about this time that the disciples had a dispute among themselves "which of them should be accounted the greatest" in that earthly kingdom which they then imagined our Lord was about to set up on earth. It is possible that one of the disciples had given offence to St. Peter, and St. Peter had found it hard to forgive him. And now, after he heard the evangelical law of forgiveness laid down by our Lord, he asked how often he was to forgive his brother. The duty of forgiving once he could understand, or twice, or thrice. But was there to be no limit? Was he to forgive seven times, seven being the Jewish symbol of perfection? There was a fundamental error in the question, because it implied a right on the part of man, when he forgave another, to withhold that forgiveness. But man has no such right. "What hast thou," asked St. Paul, "that thou hast not received?" In another place he said to the Christians of his day, and to us through them, "Ye are not your own; ye are bought with a price." We are not our own to do just as we please. None of our faculties is our own exclusively. Of our personal gifts not less than of our external possessions we are not owners, but stewards, and are just as

responsible for the use or abuse of one as of the other. Sinful man has no right to refuse forgiveness to the man who has offended him; and therefore our Lord answered St. Peter's question with the proclamation of "new commandment" of love: "I say not unto thee, Until seven times; but, Until seventy-times seven." That is to say, there must be no limit to our forgiveness. We must always forgive, no matter how often we are offended. However much we may be wronged, we must always be ready with a loving mind to forgive the offender when he shows the faintest sign of penitence. The only limit must be the man's own impenitence. That does not limit us; it only limits his capacity of receiving our forgiveness and benefiting by our Christian conduct. Therefore, Christ went on to say, in order that men might understand how entirely erroneous was their point of view—"Therefore is the Kingdom of Heaven likened unto a certain king who would take account of his servants." It does not seem to have been a final reckoning that is here intended, but rather a sudden scrutiny, to test the fidelity of his servants and see how the various departments of his kingdom stood. "When he began to reckon, one was brought to him"—probably a viceroy set over some distant province. He was brought, he did not come willingly. He was a

defaulter, and had embezzled or squandered his master's money to the extent of ten thousand talents (£2,400,000). As he could not pay that vast sum, his master "commanded him to be sold, and his wife and children, and all that he had." That was a common custom in Eastern lands, and it was allowed, with some merciful modifications, under the Jewish law. The wretched man knew what it meant. He was a man who had probably lived in affluence all his days, and had never known by personal experience what want was. He knew what slavery meant, and was probably himself a slave-holder. He knew that the slave had absolutely no rights, that he was treated worse than the brutes of the field. He pictured to himself the fate that was so suddenly to overwhelm him. And he knew more. Not only was he himself to be sold, and his own back to be exposed to the lashes of the servants of his new master, but his wife and children also were to be sold. He had some domestic affections, and he knew what that meant. He had seen families sold in the market-place, the husband and father going to one slave-master, the wife to another, and the children to a third. All this came vividly before his mind; he was appalled at the calamity, and throwing himself at the feet of the king he begged for mercy. "Have patience with

me," he said, "and I will pay thee all." An extravagant and absurd promise, for the debt was so vast that payment on his part was out of the question. The pitiable condition of the man appealed to the tender heart of the king; he "was moved with compassion, and loosed him and forgave him the debt." The man was glad to escape, but we read nothing of his gratitude. The moment he was free he rushed from his master's presence; but, as events soon showed, without any change in his character. He met one of his fellow-servants who owed him the trifling sum of "300 pence" (about £3 10*s.*), and, seizing him by the throat, demanded immediate payment of the debt. His fellow-servant offered the same petition which the other had offered to the king; but, forgetting the mercy he had received, the relentless creditor dragged his victim to prison, and there left him till he paid the debt. He had forgotten that other eyes were upon him than those of the wretched debtor, and that a report of what he had done must be carried to his generous master, who had so mercifully forgiven him that huge debt. The other servants, being indignant at the outrage they had witnessed, carried the report of what had been done to the king, who at once called back the debtor and said, "O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that

debt because thou desiredst me; shouldst not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow-servant even as I had pity on thee? And his lord was wroth and delivered him to the tormentors till he should pay all that was due unto him." "So, likewise," said Christ, "shall My Heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses."

Let us try to realize the warning which our Lord Himself has given us in this parable. The defaulter owed a huge debt: an illustration of the sinner's condition. As soon as our Divine Master begins to reckon He finds we are His debtors to an enormous extent; that we owe a debt which it is absolutely impossible for us to pay: it is overwhelming and crushing. Like the servant in the parable, we have been brought to our Lord. We did not go willingly. He had to use force, the force of sorrow, sickness, disappointment, bereavement, taking from us, mayhap, the desire of our eyes, and shivering our idols around us, that we might realize our misery and desolation. And then, in the extremity of our need, we have been, like the culprit in the parable, ready to promise anything, to offer any conditions, however extravagant and preposterous, if only we could avert the terrible doom that overshadowed us. Perhaps we were stretched on

a bed of suffering: the shadows of death around us; the horror of sin—perhaps for the first time—haunting us; a wasted life upbraiding us; lost opportunities, unrepented words and deeds and thoughts; all long forgotten, perhaps, but now trooping out upon the field of memory like the stars in a cloudless sky when the sun has sunk behind the hills. Appalled at the vision, we cried for mercy and patience, asked for more time, one more opportunity; and then indeed at last we would turn over a new leaf and make a strenuous effort to make up for lost time. We made good resolutions, honestly at the moment, and were liberal of promises, if only we were delivered from this danger. Hell is said to be paved with good intentions. Men are quick to make good resolutions when they are in distress; but when the threatening storm has passed, and the sea is calm again, and the sunshine once more makes all Nature look glad, then the good resolutions vanish with the storm, the promises are forgotten, and the old sinful life is begun all over again.

The conduct of the wicked servant in the parable is, I fear, far from uncommon, even in its details. Let us examine ourselves. We have been wronged, and if we have not taken the offender literally by the throat, we refused to forgive him, hardened our hearts against him, wished some misfortune would

happen to him, done him a bad turn when we had the chance, listened gladly to disparaging remarks upon him, repeated scandalous tales against him. But what is all that but an exhibition of his spirit who, having experienced the compassion of royal love went out and refused to forgive a fellow-sinner a trivial offence? Has such a man a right to expect that the Master will forgive him a second time? Our forgiveness must be from the heart, not from the lips only. There must be no limit to our mercy, however gross the offence. And we are not to treat the offender with scornful indifference; we are to seek him, to follow him, to use all our powers of persuasion to bring the sense of guilt home to his mind. We are not to leave him in his impenitent state. The administrators of justice are of course bound to administer the law and to vindicate justice. And the essence of justice is in the first place to redress the wrong, and in the second place to prevent others from following the bad example of the wrong-doer. A great English lawyer and judge once said to a convicted criminal: "You are punished, not because you have stolen a horse, but in order that horses may not be stolen." I venture to say that that was a wrong statement of the case. The criminal is punished not only to warn others against wrong-doing, but to

vindicate eternal justice. But our Lord's words in the text are not addressed to the official dispensers of justice, except in so far as they too may be tempted to allow personal or party feelings to sway their judgment. His words are addressed to each of us as really as they were addressed to His disciples in Judæa. Never forget, then, when you have been injured, that your duty is not only to refrain from retaliating, not simply to retire upon your dignity and self-respect, not to leave the offender severely alone; but to seek him out, to reason with him, to pray for him, to exhaust all your powers of persuasion, all the resources of gentleness and love. It is only when all this has been done that your responsibility is ended, and you are justified in leaving him to be dealt with by Almighty God. Has it ever occurred to you, that as often as you say the Lord's Prayer in an unforgiving spirit, you are actually asking God to refuse forgiveness to you in your hour of need? "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us;" *i.e.* "deal with me as I deal with those who have offended me. In the degree in which I forgive or refuse to forgive them, so do Thou, O God, forgive, or refuse to forgive me." Awful thought! Never say the Lord's Prayer again without examining your conscience whether you retain in any corner of your

heart a spirit of unforgiveness against any one. And if your conscience accuse you, make then and there an act of love towards the person who has offended you, and make at the same time a resolution—and keep it—to take the first opportunity of returning good for the wrong which has been done to you. We are all members of one family, and the vilest sinner was made in the image of God. His nature is still Divine, and however much the image and superscription of the King may be marred and crusted over with sin, it is still there; and your duty is to recover it as far as you may, to help to purge it of its grossness, and bring to light the hidden lineaments of the Divine ideal. All sin comes, in a sense, from ignorance. No one would harbour sin in his breast who really and fully knew its poisonous nature; he would as soon think of harbouring a viper. We do not resent the misconduct of the insane; we pity them as the victims of a sad malady. The sinner is a much greater object of pity. He knows not what he is doing; and the wrong he does to you returns sevenfold into his own bosom. Remember that, and the thought of it will make forgiveness much easier to you. Above all, think of Him who died for a sinful and an unthankful world, and whose mercies "are new every morning." "For there is mercy with Thee: *therefore* shalt Thou be feared."

XXI.

A VENTURE OF FAITH.

"*And Simon answering said unto Him, Master, we have toiled all the night, and have taken nothing: nevertheless at Thy word I will let down the net.*"—LUKE v. 5.

WE have here a rare example of faith. Simon and his brother Andrew had been fishing all night on the lake of Galilee, together with the two sons of Zebedee, and had taken nothing. On the morrow, as the fishermen were on the shore cleaning and drying their nets, Jesus appeared upon the scene, surrounded by a crowd of admiring followers. His pure soul was keenly sensitive to every phase and form of natural beauty, and the lovely scenery around the lake of Galilee had evidently a peculiar charm for Him. There He had spent His childhood and youth and early manhood. He had often wandered among the hills, breathing their fresh air, and often gazed upon the lake below, fringed with the beautiful oleander,

which still grows there in abundance. He had beheld the sower going out to sow, and had seen the fields "white already to harvest." He had admired pensively the short-lived glory of "the lilies of the field," and had watched the good shepherd tending his flock and rejoicing over the recovery of the lost sheep, while "the hireling, whose own the sheep were not," fled on the approach of danger, leaving the sheep to perish. And have we not a pathetic token of His attachment to the secluded beauty of His early home in the fact that He chose "a mountain in Galilee" as a trysting-place for His followers before He left them? As if He yearned once more to look in visible form on the peaceful scene which He had learned to love before He began His public ministry. And perhaps a deeper pathos still is suggested by His choice of Bethany as the spot from which the "cloud received Him out of their sight": that sweet nook on the shoulder of Olivet, where He had so often found refreshment of mind and body as He passed up and down the steep winding road that leads to Jericho. Was Lazarus, whom He had raised from the dead, a witness of that scene? and the sorrowing sisters, whose heaviness He had so suddenly turned into joy? The Evangelists are silent; but we can hardly doubt that the brother and sisters were allowed to

share with the eleven the privilege of seeing "the everlasting gates lift up their heads," that "the King of glory" might "go in."

But let us return to the scene on the lake of Galilee. "As the people pressed upon Him to hear the word of God," "He entered into one of the boats, which was Simon's, and prayed him that he would thrust out a little from the land. And He sat down, and taught the people out of the boat." And when He had made an end of speaking, "He said unto Simon, Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught." Simon answered: "Master, we have toiled all the night, and have taken nothing: nevertheless at Thy word I will let down the net." At this time, remember, Simon was not a regular disciple of our Lord. It was only after the miraculous draught of fishes that he and his companions "forsook all and followed Him." Till then His acquaintance with Jesus was comparatively slight. He knew Him only as a carpenter of Nazareth, who had lately begun to follow the calling of a prophet, and was endowed with wonderful powers of speech and working miracles. On the other hand, Simon was at his own trade. He knew the lake of Galilee well, and the habits of its fish, and the best time for catching them; and he knew that broad daylight was the most unlikely time.

Yet here was this Galilean carpenter, who presumably knew nothing about fishing, bidding him "launch out into the deep and let down his nets for a draught." Why should he obey? Why wet and foul his nets again in so bootless a venture? Simon's answer shows that thoughts like these passed quickly through his mind. But he put them aside and determined to make the venture in spite of the strong probability that it would be all in vain. "Nevertheless at Thy word I will let down the net." And his faith was rewarded with an abundance which amazed and frightened him. "Depart from me," he exclaimed, "for I am a sinful man, O Lord." He recognized in the carpenter of Nazareth something more than met the eye, a being of a superhuman character; and his nearness to such a being made Simon realize his own sinfulness with an intensity which he had never felt before.

Now we are, as Christians, under the same kind of trial which brought out Simon's faith so splendidly. The evidences for Christianity are far from being as strong as they might be. A great deal of plausible argument may be urged against it. It is full of improbabilities, and to some the balance of improbabilities may seem to outweigh the probabilities. If Christianity is so important a religion as it is

alleged to be, why is not the evidence stronger, as it might very well be? Why is it not overwhelming, leaving no room for doubt? Why has not God written His name and revealed His will in characters of light upon the sky, so that all men might see and understand? One of the most religious men of our time, viewing the world with the eye of reason alone, was constrained to write as follows: "Starting," he says, "with the being of a God (which, as I have said, is as certain to me as the certainty of my own existence, though when I try to put the grounds of that certainty into logical shape I find a difficulty in doing so in mood and figure to my satisfaction), I look out of myself into the world of men, and there I see a sight which fills me with unspeakable distress. The world seems simply to give the lie to that great truth, of which my whole being is so full; and the effect upon me is, in consequence, as a matter of necessity, as confusing as if it denied that I am in existence myself. If I looked into a mirror and did not see my face, I should have the sort of feeling which actually comes upon me, when I look into this living busy world and see no reflection of its Creator. This is to me one of the great difficulties of this absolute primary truth, to which I referred just now. Were it not for this voice, speaking so clearly in my conscience and my heart, I

should be an atheist, or a pantheist, or a polytheist, when I looked into the world."[1]

It is not Christianity alone, you see, it is theism, the belief in a personal Creator and Governor of the universe, which is at stake, if demonstrative proof of His existence be demanded. Bishop Butler proved long ago that, as far as argument goes, theism and Christianity stand or fall together. So that if we believe in God at all, we must also believe that He has some good reason for leaving the evidence of His existence and purposes towards us far less cogent than it might be. Our Saviour, while on earth, persistently refused to give the Jews a "sign" of His being the Messiah, though He might easily have done so. He rose from the dead in the grey dawn, with no witnesses save the dazed Roman guard. He showed Himself in private to His immediate followers; and when He made an appointment with "five hundred brethren at once," it was "on a mountain in Galilee," out of sight of the very people who needed proof. And instead of ascending to heaven from some conspicuous place, where He might have been seen by all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, He chose a secluded spot with no other witnesses than a few intimate friends.

Why is all this? Because the growth of Christian

[1] Newman's "Apologia," pp. 376, 377.

character is rooted in love, and love is based on faith, and faith is not a matter of demonstration, but of reasonable belief. It is so in our appreciation of human beings. We can know thoroughly only those whom we love, and the more we love them, the better we shall know them. But our love of human beings must begin in some knowledge of them. Our knowledge of God, on the contrary, must begin in love. Human things must be known to be loved; Divine things must be loved to be known. Simon felt the spell of that gracious Presence in his boat, and he yielded to its magnetic attraction against all probabilities. It was to his faith and love, not to his reason, that Jesus made the appeal, and Simon felt that he could trust Him in spite of all appearances. It was in this way that Jesus dealt with His disciples after He had risen from the dead. It is wonderful how long it took them to convince themselves of His resurrection. "Fools and slow of heart" He called them—a description which the facts more than justified. They would not believe each other's reports of His reappearance. They hardly believed even their own senses. They saw Him and were convinced. He disappeared, and they began to doubt. After seeing Him repeatedly in Jerusalem after His resurrection, Simon and the sons of Zebedee returned to Galilee and resumed their

calling as fishermen. The narrative plainly shows that they were still in doubt and in perplexity: anxious to believe, but requiring more proof. Was it really Himself whom they had seen and talked to? or was it an apparition, a spectral delusion? They were again but Galilean fishermen. The Pharisees still sat in Moses' seat; the Roman yoke was still unbroken; the Messiah's kingdom was apparently as far off as ever. So they went back to their old life by the lake of Galilee, but now with no one to tell them when to "launch out into the deep," no one in the boat to still the angry waves with a royal command, and bring them into the haven where they would be. And when He appears to them even there they are still in doubt, still unable to make up their minds what to make of it all. They were like men awaking from a vivid dream. For a while the spell remains. The dreamer, in the visions of the night, finds his dead restored to life, and believes on waking that the reality was really the dream. But daylight comes, and he opens his eyes and looks around, and sees again the empty chair, and finds silence where, but a moment ago, the well-known voice was speaking.

Of that kind was the unwilling scepticism of the Lord's nearest friends after His resurrection. The crucifixion was a terrible blow to their hopes. It

went counter to all their expectations. They were not in the least prepared for it, and when the blow fell it stupefied them. They were utterly bewildered, smitten in heart and confused in mind, tossed upon a sea of doubt, without chart or compass to guide them; their minds wavering, but their hearts clinging still with desperate hope to the belief that "it had been He which should have redeemed Israel." For the heart often retains its hold on truth long after the mind has resigned itself to doubt. How does Christ meet this mood of reluctant scepticism? Not by manifesting Himself at once, but by leading those honest doubters onward to take a larger view, to raise their minds from petty details, and consider the evidence as a whole. He makes Himself strange to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, and lifting their minds away from their present distress, "and beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." When He had in this way prepared their minds and inflamed their hearts by enabling them to look at the matter from a fresh point of view, He revealed Himself to them. Had He done so prematurely, their hearts would have leapt towards Him, but their heads would have remained unconvinced, and their doubts would have returned. For in the

battle with unbelief the head commonly wins if its questionings remain unanswered. It is an unequal struggle, and the heart will at last tire of trying to feed an unresponsive mind with faith, and will cease its efforts.

And is not Christ's method the right method still? To the honest doubter I say, "Launch out into the deep." Don't hug the shore. Avoid the breakers. The danger lies in the meeting of sea and land. There is safety in either; deadly peril in the collision between the two. And so in the spiritual life the danger lies, not in the spiritual element, nor yet in the natural, but in their contact, when the water is shallow and the land is hidden. Don't trouble yourself with petty criticism about the authorship or date of this book, or the authenticity of that text. These are interesting questions for scholars, but they are irrelevant to the issue. "Launch out into the deep." Elevate your vision. Look abroad upon the world and compare Christendom with all that lies outside of it. The difference is immeasurable. It is the difference between civilization and barbarism, between light and darkness. And to what is the difference due? To Christianity only. No other reasonable cause can be assigned. Those therefore who deny the supernatural origin of Christianity

must account for Christendom. If Christ was not more than man the history of His religion is a miracle. For if He was not more than man He was merely an unlearned Galilean carpenter, unversed in the philosophies of the world. How did He come to project upon the world a religion which consists of a comparatively small number of fundamental principles capable of universal application, and to predict the success of His religion, by the process of gradual development, with the calm confidence of one who saw the end from the beginning? And what specifically differentiated His religion from all other religions and philosophical systems was the unique fact that He made the essence of His system to consist in loyal devotion to His own person. "Abide in Me" is the refrain of His doctrine. "I am the Way, the Truth, the Life, the Resurrection. He that believeth in Me shall never die." He proclaimed Himself as the Ideal of humanity, the *nexus* between God and man, the one Mediator that could bridge the chasm between the creature and the Creator. It was this faith in a living Person, who had conquered death and was "alive for evermore," having "opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers," that inspired His early followers, mostly unlearned and in humble life, with an enthusiasm

before which Greek philosophy and Roman statecraft and military force eventually succumbed. Listen to the impression which this generic difference between Christ and all other teachers made upon the mind of one of the greatest intellects in the history of mankind. In one of his conversations at St. Helena Napoleon spoke as follows:—"I have been accustomed to put before me the examples of Alexander and Cæsar, with the hope of rivalling their exploits and living in the minds of men for ever. Yet, after all, in what sense does Alexander, in what sense does Cæsar live? Who knows or cares anything about them? . . . But, on the contrary, there is just one Name in the world that lives. It is the Name of One who passed His years in obscurity, and who died a malefactor's death. Eighteen hundred years have gone since that time, but still it has its hold upon the human mind. It has possessed the world, and it maintains possession. Amid the most varied nations, under the most diversified circumstances, in the most cultivated, in the rudest of races and intellects, in all classes of society, the owner of that great Name reigns. High and low, rich and poor, acknowledge Him. Millions of souls are conversing with Him, are venturing on His word, are looking for His presence. Palaces, sumptuous, innumerable, are raised to His

honour; His image, as in the hour of His deepest humiliation, is triumphantly displayed in the proud city, in the open country, in the corners of streets, on the tops of mountains. . . . It is worn next the heart in life; it is held before the fainting eyes in death. Here then is One who is not a mere name, who is not a mere fiction. He is dead and gone, but still He lives—lives as the living energetic thought of successive generations, as the awful motive power of a thousand great events. He has done without effort what others with lifelong struggles have failed to do. Can He be less than Divine?"

Surely that must be the natural conclusion of every unprejudiced man who surveys the history of Christianity as compared with all other religious and ethical systems. But I may be challenged to account for the success of Islam, resulting also from devotion to its founder, whose name is proclaimed daily from every minaret of the Muslim world as the Pattern Man of the True Believer, and the all-powerful and sole mediator between God and man. I accept the challenge and appeal to the history of Islam. Every country where Islam rules is now, compared to what it was, a desert, full of iniquity and "cruel habitations." Persia, Turkey, Afghanistan, Morocco: behold

there the fruit of Islam! Other evidence is superfluous. Islam has ever been a blight and a curse to every land that it has ruled. History records not one exception; not even Spain under the Moors.

But I may be told that examples in abundance may be found in Christendom of men who do not own allegiance to the name of Christ, yet who nevertheless live model lives — virtuous, unselfish, pure. True, but irrelevant. I know Unitarians and Agnostics whose lives are noble, putting to shame the majority of professing Christians. But the way to judge of a system is not by exceptional instances, but by its general results; by its action on the mass, not by isolated cases, which may owe their excellence to some other cause. A good unbeliever, born and bred in a Christian land, is not the product of his unbelief, but of the system which has nurtured him. He is hedged in by Christian ideas, principles, customs, laws, language; he breathes a Christian atmosphere; Christianity percolates through all the pores of his moral and spiritual life; in a word, he is a Christian without knowing it, for the mould in which his character has been cast is Christian. He is an argument for Christianity, not against it. I repeat, then, that those who deny the supernatural origin of Christianity are bound to account for Christendom.

If Christianity be not what it claims to be—the creation of One who is more than man—then Christianity is itself a miracle greater than the Incarnation. That transcends reason. A Christianity without the Christ of Christendom would contradict it.

But, after all, the evidence for Christianity is on the same plane as the evidence on which men act in the ordinary affairs of life; that is to say, it is moral, not mathematical evidence. We are all loyal subjects of Queen Victoria, and our loyalty is based, not merely on our devotion to her person as one who adorns the throne on which she sits, but on our belief that she is the legitimate occupant of that throne. But what kind of evidence have we for our belief? The same evidence on which every nobleman holds his title, every landowner his estate, every one of us his legitimate descent. It is moral evidence, incapable of demonstrative proof. And so it is throughout the conduct of life. "Probability," as Bishop Butler has said, "is the guide of life." And the question as regards Christianity is whether the probability is strong enough to warrant our belief in it. If you look at the matter from the point of view which I have suggested, I think you will find that—to take the lowest ground—it is more probable that Christianity should be true than that, being false, it

should have had such a marvellous success and produced such beneficial results. It has abolished slavery and polygamy, restored woman to her rightful position, humanized war, proclaimed and enforced the sanctity of human life—but for Christianity, who would ever have dreamt of an Employers' Liabilities Act?—in a word, it has created modern civilization. If Christianity is not based on the Incarnation and Resurrection of the Son of God, it is an imposture—there is no other alternative—and it is contrary to reason and experience to believe that a religion rooted in imposture should have had such a career as Christianity has had. Nor does it show any sign of decay. Other religions have had their day—their period of growth and vigour, and their decline and death. But Christianity is to-day as fresh and vigorous as at any period of its nineteen centuries of life. And it is, moreover, the only religion which has proved its adaptability to all races and to all ranks and conditions of life. Well then may we ask, with Napoleon, whether the Founder of such a religion can be less than Divine.

And now let me conclude with one or two practical inferences from Simon's noble venture of faith. It should teach us all to persevere in face of every discouragement, when we know that what we are doing

is right. You may have—we all have—some master temptation, some besetting sin which more easily besets you than other sins. Your duty is to make special war on that temptation; for until you have conquered it, your victory over other temptations is of little use. You know that in battle there is what soldiers call the key of the position—some spot which will give its possessor a great advantage over his enemy. Now there is always a key of the position in the unceasing warfare of the Christian against his spiritual enemies, and his business is to master that position. Well, you have struggled for it a long time perhaps. You have watched and prayed against your temptation; but you have always yielded in the end. And at last you lose heart and think it is no use to try any longer, no use to watch and pray any more. In that moment remember Simon's answer: "Master, we have toiled all the night, and have taken nothing: nevertheless at Thy word I will let down the net." If he had not done so the shoal of fish would have passed by, and he would have had another night of fruitless toil. And you too may be tempted to give up the fight at the very moment when one more effort would give you the victory. Or it may be that your difficulty is external. You have some trouble or trial in your family, or business,

or work; and you have striven bravely against it, have toiled all night, and have taken nothing. Never mind. Be not discouraged. Struggle on. Victory may be within your grasp when you are about to yield. And it does not follow that you have not triumphed because you do not see outward tokens of victory. Elijah did not know that his true victory was not in the transitory triumph on Mount Carmel, but in the unseen homes of the seven thousand in Israel who, braced by his example, had refused to bow the knee to the image of Baal. Rest assured that no effort made for Christ in the battle against the world, the flesh, and the devil, is ever made in vain.

XXII.

SEEKING THE LIVING AMONG THE DEAD.

"*And as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead?*"—LUKE xxiv. 5.

THE question was addressed to the pious women who had gone "very early" in the morning of the first Easter Day to render the last offices of love to the dead body, as they believed, of their departed Friend and Benefactor. For He was buried so late on Friday evening that there was no time before the sabbath to use the spices which the women had bought for His burial. On the way to the tomb "they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?" It was a new tomb hewn in the rock of Calvary,[1] which bounded the garden of

[1] It is clear, from John xix. 41, that Joseph's tomb was close to Golgotha. The first doubt cast on the traditional site of Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre was in the year 1751 by a schoolmaster of Altona.

Joseph of Arimathea; and at the entrance into the tomb there was a groove cut into the rock to admit a

named Korte. The archæological evidence in its favour has been increasing with the progress of excavation, tending to show that the traditional site is outside the second wall. The historical evidence amounts almost to demonstration. (1) Golgotha derives its name from an old Jewish tradition that the skull of Adam was found there, and that his body was buried at Golgotha. Another tradition identified Golgotha with the scene of Isaac's arrested sacrifice. The name had nothing to do with the shape of the hill, and still less with its being a place of public execution. As if a spot in a fashionable suburb would have been selected as a place of public execution! (2) Golgotha being a spot held in veneration by Jews and Christians, Hadrian, when he determined to efface Jerusalem, as far as possible, from the page of history, covered Golgotha and the adjoining tomb with a huge mound of earth, and erected over it a temple to Venus, to desecrate the site. (3) This temple was a standing witness of the site of Golgotha when Constantine ordered the mound to be removed, and the Holy Sepulchre was recovered. (4) Constantine and his officials knew that Golgotha was outside the wall of Jerusalem when Christ was crucified; therefore they would not have accepted the authenticity of a site which was inside the wall in A.D. 326 if they had not known that the second wall (which bounded the city in the time of Christ) passed inside the traditional site. (5) There were maps of Jerusalem in the Roman archives of Jerusalem, Cæsarea, and Rome, so perfect in details that every spot could have been identified by measurement from the Temple area. So that if there had been any doubt it could have been solved at once by reference to that map. (6) The tradition in favour of the historical site has come down to us unbroken. (7) There is not a scrap of evidence, archæological, historical, or traditional, in favour of any other site. An attempt has been made in our own day to identify Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre with a hillock outside the Damascus Gate, considerably beyond the line even of the third wall. There is evidence to show that this was the Jews' place of stoning, and it was certainly a place of public sepulture: two facts which alone prove that it could not have been Golgotha; for it is quite inconceivable that the Jews would have allowed one of their most sacred

heavy circular stone in shape like a millstone.[1] This made it easy, you see, to "seal" the stone, which fitted exactly into the groove prepared for it. It explains also the difficulty which troubled the women as to "rolling away the stone from the door of the sepulchre." But when they arrived "they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre; and they entered in and found not the body of the Lord Jesus." The difficulty which troubled them had vanished, and another difficulty, strange and unexpected, had taken its place. The stone was rolled away, but the tomb was empty: a parable of many a human life since then. How often does the fulfilment of our desires lead to disappointment! A man sets his heart on making a fortune, rising early, and going late to rest, and eating the bread of carefulness, hoping to enjoy one day a well-earned repose. He makes his fortune, and retires from business to spend the evening of his

spots in the Holy Land to be thus defiled; and wealthy members of the Sanhedrim, like Joseph of Arimathea, would certainly not have had their villas and gardens abutting on a place of public execution and burial, which, apart from other reasons, would have exposed them to ceremonial defilement every time they left their homes. I have given the evidence for the traditional site at length in an article in the *Contemporary Review*, February, 1892, supplemented by an article in the *Guardian* of August 30, 1893.

[1] An example of those rock-hewn tombs, with the circular stone door *in situ*, may still be seen at the Tombs of the Kings just outside Jerusalem.

life in the quiet happiness of which he had dreamt. But he is not happy, for his happiness lay in the pursuit of riches, not in the possession; and having allowed that pursuit to absorb him, he has now no other resource on which he can fall back; and he is miserable. Or he has made fame his aim, and sacrificed everything at that shrine—health, principle, perhaps friends and self-respect. And he succeeds. His name is on every tongue. The prize is within his reach. The stone is rolled away, and he "enters in" to find—an empty tomb; nothing but the grave-clothes of his hopes. Or perhaps his heart was set on marriage. He sought his happiness in wedded life, and laid out his plans accordingly. He saved money, or looked out for a woman of fortune, or married from impulse, without any experience of life or discipline of temper. He enters in, and finds not the body for which he had prepared his spices, for it was not there. He was seeking the living among the dead. He had never reflected that such close and lifelong companionship, as marriage implies, demands daily love—which means daily unselfishness; and he had never practised self-denial. And so, instead of the body, he found only the grave-clothes.

The mistake in all these plans for the future is that men start by making happiness their being's end and

aim. If you make happiness your aim, you will never be happy; for happiness is not a stable and constant thing like gold or precious gems, which you can obtain and hold. Its root is in yourself, and it varies with your changing moods. The happiness of the child is not the happiness of the youth, nor the youth's the happiness of manhood, nor that of manhood the happiness of old age. Your ideal of happiness is thus always changing. So that if you make happiness an end in itself, you are like children pursuing a rainbow, which always recedes as they advance; or like a traveller in the desert, who finds that the refreshing water which allured him from afar is but a treacherous mirage. Do what is right, and happiness will come at last without your seeking it, and perhaps when you least expect it. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things will be added unto you." That is the rule laid down by Him who "knew what was in man," and it is the only true rule. Act upon it, and you will never be really unhappy. Regulus, on his return from Rome to Carthage to meet a terrible death, was a happier man than he would have been if he had betrayed his country. It was a common matter of observation during the persecution of the Church in early days, that while the martyrs looked radiantly

happy at the stake or on their way to the wild beasts, the lapsed—that is, Christians whom fear had driven to deny the faith—looked downcast and miserable. We have two natures, one of which seeks its gratification in the pleasures of the senses, the other in the pleasures of the spirit; and in order to serve the one we must sacrifice the other. "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for My sake shall find it." In submitting to the lower life, that is, we shall lose the true life; and in subduing the lower life we shall save the higher.

But let us return to the women at the Saviour's sepulchre. It would seem that on finding the tomb empty they tried other tombs in the neighbourhood, for it was a fashionable suburb of Jerusalem, and other private persons, like Joseph, had their family tombs in their gardens. Perhaps Joseph himself had another tomb in his garden, since this was a new one. Mary Magdalene thought that Joseph's gardener had removed the body of Jesus to another tomb, and asked our Lord, "supposing Him to be the gardener," to lead her to it. After their fruitless search they returned to the empty tomb bewildered and distressed, and now saw two angels, who asked them, with gentle reproach, "Why seek ye the living One among the dead?" Why search among dead bodies for Him who

is the Author and Giver of life, and sums up in Himself all the potentialities of human being? St. Peter accused the Jews of having "killed the Prince of life" —an expression which implies in the original much more than the word "prince." It means the leader, ruler, source of life; whom therefore to have slain would have been to quench the life of the universe. Then why seek the living One among the dead? It was a paradox; and it betrayed also forgetfulness of the Master's words. "He is not here, but is risen. Remember how He spake unto you when He was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again. And they remembered His words." This reference of the angels to our Lord's sayings in Galilee imply that they heard His conversations there, and suggest the awful thought that they hear ours also. If that be so, we are never alone. Our words are audible to beings whom we do not see, and leave their impress indelibly upon the all-pervading air. Modern science has in this matter confirmed in a wonderful way the hints and partial revelations of the Bible. We now know not only that the air is a vast library on whose pages our words are registered, but that the human voice can be made audible at a distance of hundreds

of miles; nay, that our words are not merely preserved, but that they can be made to speak long after we are dead. Terrible thought! Can anything be conceived more awful than for a man to pass out of this life, and then discover with the quickened senses of spiritual existence that words which he uttered, perhaps idly and thoughtlessly, are still living, and are repeating themselves in space, and he cannot silence them? A word once uttered is beyond recall. It may circulate on an errand of mischief to the end of time, and you cannot stop it. It seems that in the spiritual world there is nothing corresponding to our ideas of distance and nearness. Spiritual beings do not travel through space. Like thought, they are instantaneously where they wish to be. And so, when Holy Scripture speaks of angels "appearing," the word literally means "became visible." The change is in the spectator, not in the angel. This truth has its counterpart even in this world, for the masters of physical science assure us that atoms of matter, separated by the whole distance of the globe, are in constant communication, attracting each other as if nothing lay between them.

"Why seek ye the living among the dead?" Do not multitudes of Christians go on from age to age repeating the error of the women at the sepulchre,

and with far less excuse? What is this world for many but a vast sepulchre of buried hopes? Look back from old age, or even from middle life, upon the years that are gone, and how hard it is to recall the ecstasy of delight caused by things which now make no impression! Pleasures which you once lived for have lost their relish. Joys for which you would have sold a birthright are now seen to have been a mess of pottage. A renown which cost health, and comfort, and perchance truth and honour, is grasped at last and found a shadow. Thus you see that what the desires of youth are to manhood, and the pursuits of manhood to old age, so will the interests of this present life seem to the disembodied spirit, as it looks back on scenes which then appeared important, and now appear so trivial.

And the angels' question is a warning also to those who cling to old forms from which the spirit has departed; who refuse to obey the law of progress and move with the times; who strive to confine the limbs of manhood in the garments of childhood, opposing wise and salutary reforms, and thereby preparing the way for revolution. How many a change, which was feared at the time as a portentous revolution, has in due season assumed its proper place as a needed reform in Church or State. Truth, itself unchanging,

is ever clothing itself in new forms adapted to new conditions. It was because the Jewish Church of old refused to acknowledge this truth that it perished. It was a stage in the evolution of God's dealings with mankind, and it insisted on being the end of the process. It refused to recognize its "day," and the purpose of God passed by and left it—now a carcase out of which the life had departed—to the devouring eagles. You may be sure of this, as a general rule, that no Church or institution ever perished except by its own fault; by "seeking the living among the dead," and relying on human aid to remove the stone from the door of the sepulchre, instead of remembering the promise of Jesus, that life comes from the cross.

There is no need to pursue the thought further. It must be plain to any who reflect at all, that all seek the living among the dead who lay up their treasures upon earth, and are making no provision for the future. Jerusalem had her time of visitation. She neglected it, and her house was left unto her desolate. If she had known, even at the eleventh hour, the things which belonged unto her peace, it would have been well with her. Her fate is a perpetual warning to nations and to individuals. If we could see into each other's inner being as God sees,

we should probably be able to put our finger on the point at which a ruined soul received its fatal bias. In the lives of most individuals, and possibly of most nations, there is probably a critical moment which decides the issue. Up to that point all may be doubtful, all possible; then the crisis is reached, when one single act, it may be of slight significance in itself, consolidates a series of previous acts into a rigid unchanging character, and the man or nation is lost. For a time no change is visible. Things look just the same as before. But when the trial comes there is a sudden collapse, and all is over. A while ago heaven was possible: now there is the "great gulf fixed" which cannot be passed.

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side;
Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering each the bloom or blight,
Parts the goats upon the left hand, and the sheep upon the right;
And the choice goes by for ever 'twixt that darkness and that light"

XXIII.

IGNORANT PRAYERS.[1]

"But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask."—
MATT. XX. 22.

A STRANGE answer! The two sons of Zebedee thought they knew very well what they asked. They shared at this time their nation's erroneous belief about the Messiah, thinking that He would restore the independence of the Jews, and establish a glorious kingdom upon earth. Wishing to forestall competitors, they came to Jesus with their mother, and petitioned for the two highest posts in Messiah's kingdom, signified by sitting on His right hand and on His left. They lived in an Eastern land, where honours were bestowed more as a matter of favour than as a reward of merit. John and James regarded themselves, with some reason, as special favourites of their Master. He had

[1] Preached the Sunday after the death of the Grand Duchess of Hesse (Princess Alice).

selected them, together with Peter, to be with Him on the Mount of Transfiguration and on some other occasions. They claimed, accordingly, the privilege of favourites, and must have been staggered by the answer: "Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" He did not rebuke them, you will observe, as being selfish, or ambitious, or presumptuous: He merely warned them that they knew not what they were seeking; that they had not counted the cost; that they had yet to learn the conditions of His service; that those who aspired to the honours of His kingdom must first share His suffering; that those who desired posts near His throne must drink of the chalice of agony which He was about to drain, and be sprinkled with the bloody baptism in which He was about to be immersed. The two brothers accepted the conditions, though far from understanding their nature. "We are able," they answered. And He took them at their word: "Ye shall drink indeed of My cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with: but to sit on My right hand, and on My left, is not Mine to give, but to those for whom it is prepared of My Father." You will observe that I have omitted certain words which are in italics, namely, "it shall

be given." They are not in the original, and they tend to obscure our Saviour's meaning, as if He denied His own right or power to bestow the rewards of the heavenly kingdom. What He contradicts is the erroneous notion of the two brothers as to the distribution of rewards in His kingdom. They were not to be given away, not to be arbitrarily bestowed, as is too often the case in earthly kingdoms: they were to be bestowed according to merit; they were intended for characters rather than persons, according to the unchangeable rules of eternal justice. Favouritism was therefore out of the question. If they desired the highest prizes in His kingdom they must win them. He could tell them the conditions of success, but could not promise success; that must depend on their fulfilling the necessary conditions.

Our Lord therefore encouraged the ambition of the sons of Zebedee, but warned them that they could only realize it through much effort and tribulation. For there is a true ambition and a false. Indeed, there is hardly a false desire of our nature which is not a perversion of a true one. The misery of our fallen humanity is that affections, good and noble in themselves, become debased by going astray after wrong objects. And what we need is not new affections, but right directions of those we have. Saul

the persecutor became Paul the Apostle by carrying over into the service of the Crucified Nazarene the same zeal and devotion which he had ignorantly employed in the service of the Pharisees. Even the miser, who hugs and hoards his gold, bears witness, though he knows it not, to his high and unique prerogative among the lower creatures of this earth. The brutes do not desire to become rich. This world is their all-in-all. Their desires are bounded by the passing moment. Satisfy their animal appetites, and they are contented. How different is man! His ambition is boundless. He conquers a world, and immediately sighs for a fresh world to conquer. His very miseries are the sublime discontent of a being too great for the perishable world he lives in. What does the miser's passion for gold mean? It means that there is rooted in the heart of man a desire to build up around him the means of perpetual enjoyment; to secure for himself the materials of happiness —not the happiness of the passing moment, like the brute, but happiness which shall elude the vicissitudes of life and the ravages of time.

The desire of fame bears a similar witness. It may degenerate into an ignoble, even into a cruel passion. Yet even so it attests man's instinctive longing for immortality. However man may seek

to hide it from himself, he recoils from annihilation. What mean the colossal pyramids and rock-hewn tombs of Egypt, and the monuments in all lands which record the deeds of the dead? What mean even the pyramids of human skulls which some ruthless conquerors have reared to commemorate their exploits? All these are the irrepressible homage of the human heart to the universal belief in man's immortality.

Our Lord's answer to the sons of Zebedee is therefore an incentive to Christians to aim at the highest prizes of their heavenly calling. And, in truth, unless we aim high we are not likely to obtain any prize at all. This is true even in matters of this life. That man will never reach any eminence in any department of intellectual effort, or even of mechanical skill, who is not ambitious, who does not desire to excel. Let a man be quite satisfied with his work, realize his own ideal: he will advance no further; he is more likely to go back. It is the man who is lured on by the hope of excelling his best work who is likely to achieve fame. And it is so in the spiritual world. The ideal set before us is Divine perfection: "Be ye perfect, as My Father which is in heaven is perfect." To aim at infinite perfection is to have a guarantee for everlasting progress. It

is the mark of a mean and sordid nature to aim at rendering the minimum of service necessary for admission into heaven. And it is a foolish aim in addition; for what God values is not the amount of our work, but the spirit in which we work. The widow's mite is more precious in His sight than the far richer offerings of the worldly wealthy. Let us aim, then, at the highest prizes in our Master's kingdom. But let us at the same time weigh well the cost. How little did the two sons of Zebedee know what they were undertaking when they answered, "We are able"! How little did they then imagine that one should be chosen to lead the van, the other to bring up the rear, of apostolic martyrs! And just as little can we tell what God may have in store for us. But that signifies little if we are able to say honestly, with James and John, "We are able." He will accept now, as He accepted then, the willing heart, however ignorant the understanding may be. Their prayer was ignorant, but not sinful. The direction and intention of the heart were right, and He knew that when the trial came they would be as good as their word.

Prayers may, then, be ignorant in a sinful, but also in an innocent, sense. There is sinful ignorance in prayer when the body does not exhibit the attitude

proper to prayer — sitting or lounging instead of kneeling. Who would dare to pray to an earthly sovereign in such postures? And why do men dare behave in the presence of the King of kings in a way which their own sense of propriety would forbid when they are addressing one of their fellow-creatures? Is it not because they are praying with most culpable ignorance? because they do not take the trouble to think that God is present, though they see Him not, marking every movement of their bodies, listening to every word they speak, and reading their inmost thoughts? They know this, but they keep their knowledge locked up in some back corner of their minds, and so they pray ignorantly; but it is a wicked and an impious ignorance. And they too pray ignorantly in a bad sense who, although they show the outward tokens of reverence, allow their thoughts to wander in prayer, their lips addressing Almighty God, but their thoughts and feelings being otherwise occupied. Remember the story of blind Bartimæus. When he heard that Jesus was passing by he cried with a loud voice, "Jesus, Thou Son of David, have mercy on me." And when they tried to make him hold his peace, "he cried so much the more." His thoughts did not wander. When Jesus stood before him and asked, "What wilt thou that

I shall do unto thee?" he was ready with his answer without a moment's hesitation or delay: "Lord, that I may receive my sight." A lonely and sad world is that of the blind. A great part of the Bible and of nature is to them incomprehensible. Light, colours, shadows, moon and stars, dawn and sunset, the beauty of flowers and of the human face and form, the majesty of the restless sea, the glory of mountain scenery—these and many other things are lost upon the blind. And Bartimæus longed to enjoy them, but could not. He had a sore need which he wished to have supplied, and so, when Christ addressed him he was ready at once with his answer; and his prayer was heard. Now suppose, when you are praying, that Jesus stood before you as He stood before the blind man at Jericho, and asked, "What wilt thou that I shall do unto thee?" how many of you would be ready with an answer? Would not most of us be confused and unable to answer? And if we spoke the truth, should not we be obliged to say: "Oh! I was not thinking: let me try to remember"? That is another instance of an ignorant prayer in a bad sense.

Let me recommend you to remember two rules in your prayers to God. First, when you kneel down, collect your thoughts and make a strong effort of will to realize the awful Majesty to whom you are about

to speak. Secondly, have a clear idea in your mind, before you pray, what your special temptations and needs are, and lay them especially before God. There is very little use in praying at large—confessing generally that we are sinners, and asking God's forgiveness in a general way. Prayers of that sort have a great tendency to become mere formalism. You must concentrate your prayers on special objects. And ask yourselves whenever you pray, Suppose Jesus were to ask me, as He asked the blind man, "What wilt thou that I shall do unto thee?" should I be ready with an answer? If not, the prayer will not be answered, for it deserves no answer.

And now let me give one or two examples of prayers which, like the prayer of the sons of Zebedee, may be ignorant in an innocent sense. Take the case of a man starting in life, beginning a career in some trade or profession. He asks God to prosper him in his calling; and he does well. And for a time all goes well. But presently a cloud appears on his horizon. Things go wrong with him, and ruin stares him in the face unless he can find a way out of the difficulty. He prays earnestly for deliverance, but it comes not. The cloud gets nearer and nearer, and at last bursts over him, and he finds himself a ruined man. And then, in his distress, rebellious thoughts rise up in his

mind. He thinks that God has forgotten to be gracious, and there is no use praying any more. Not so. That man's prayer was heard as the prayer of the sons of Zebedee was heard, not with posts of honour in an earthly kingdom, but with a cup of suffering and a baptism of blood. God knew him better than he knew himself. He knew that temporal prosperity would be his ruin: therefore He sent him calamity instead.

Or it may be a case of chronic illness. A man has great gifts, intellectual and moral, which are rendered useless by some infirmity of body. He is incapable of sustained effort. Racking pain or depressing languor makes him helpless and useless, as he thinks. He prays for health—at least for ease from pain, or release from that enervating lassitude which is sometimes harder to bear than pain. But the "thorn in the flesh remains," though grace is given to bear it if the patient will only submit to the Divine will. "They also serve who only stand and wait" just as truly as those who are in active service.

Or it may be that it is for some one who is dear to you that the prayer is offered, some one afflicted in mind or body. It is hard to bear; hard to see the continued inertness of that once active mind in spite of all your prayers; hard to watch the ebbing of that

precious life; to kneel and pray that it may be spared, and then to learn from the doctor's look that there is no hope. In such moments of agony there may be a temptation to think that God has forgotten to be gracious, and that the prayer might as well have been addressed to the unhearing winds. But it is not so. Be sure that He who wept by the grave of Lazarus, and raised the widow's son to life, has heard your prayer, and answered it in the way that was best. I know how cold and formal words of that kind will seem in moments of distress; but that is because we do not follow them out in detail, and see what they mean. Let me try to do this for you.

Remember, then, that God sees the end from the beginning. We cannot look into the future. To Him there is no future or past; all is one vast present. He knows, therefore, the course of every life from its birth to its maturity. He knows its trials and its power to bear them. Some characters are strengthened by temptations; others would be ruined: just as the bracing air which hardens one constitution may destroy another. Therefore "one is taken, and the other left." The character that requires the rude discipline of temptation and suffering is left to fight the battle of life. The character that would sink beneath the trial is in mercy removed.

What would you think of a doctor who yielded to your ignorant tears and prayers, and left your child to perish at home because he would not pain you by sending him abroad, to breathe in a more genial land —where you could not be with him—the air that could alone save his life? And would you expect God to be more weak and cruel than an ordinary doctor? Never think that He has refused to hear your prayer because He has not weakly yielded to your blind entreaties. He has summoned your beloved across the sea to save his life—to shield him from temptations which he could not have resisted; or to arrest the progress of some moral malady which was hidden from you. You know what an advantage it sometimes is to a patient that his doctor should be able to have him under his immediate care in some quiet place, free from noise and distraction. When Jesus was on earth, He took a patient "aside from the multitude" in order to heal him. And why should He not do so now? Believe me, many a stricken heart will one day bless Him for having refused to hear its ignorant prayers, and caused a separation for a while for the sake of a reunion for ever. Remember the story of the death and resurrection of Lazarus. When Lazarus fell ill his sisters sent at once to Jesus to tell Him of it. "He whom Thou

lovest is sick." That was the message; nothing more. They thought that He would hasten at once to heal His friend. But no. "When He had heard that he was sick, He abode two days still in the same place where He was." We can imagine the perplexity which would mingle with the anxiety of the two sisters as they went out by turns from the sick-room to see whether He was coming up the steep sinuous road from Jericho. How their hearts must have sunk when days and nights passed away, and there was no sign of His coming, or even of His thinking of their distress! And meanwhile their brother's life was fast waning to its close. And then when it was all over; when the grave was closed on their beloved; when they had returned to that once happy home, now so lonely and desolate; when they had nothing before them but a dreary future, nothing around them but memorials of a happiness that had vanished —the empty seat that should no more receive its occupant, the clothes that never should be worn again; when, in fact, it was all too late, their Friend, the Healer of the sick, the Raiser of the dead, appeared. And how natural and touching is the timid reproach with which the sisters, one after the other, greet Him: "Lord, if Thou hadst been here, my brother had not died"—a reproach which has found

an echo in many a mourner's heart since then. And yet it was just because He was there, watching that ebbing life, hearing those passionate prayers, counting those scalding tears, that Lazarus was allowed to die. He knew that in their lowest depth of woe He could turn back their heaviness into joy. He had a spell which could overcome death, and He meant, when all hope was gone, to use it. And who can doubt that the sisters' joy in getting their brother back from the grave was a thousandfold greater than the joy of having never lost him? And so it will be with other mourners when Jesus comes, however long He may have delayed.

Or it may be that God has some use for the life which He takes away in youth or manhood. For He deigns to have need of all of us. And He distributes His talents variously: to some one talent, to another five; and bids them "Occupy till I come." To each task is allotted its own time, and when the task is done the faithful servant is summoned to "enter into the joy of his Lord," where doubtless some other work is found for him. For you must not suppose that the spiritual life is without active employments. Every soul there, you may be sure, finds full employment for all its faculties. All our Lord's teaching goes to show this. The man who

has used his talents well on earth is provided with a larger field for their exercise in the spiritual world. See what a light this thought sheds on deaths which seem to us premature. A man is cut off in the meridian of his life and usefulness, and we think, "What a waste! What a loss to his family, or cause, or country!" Not so. He has finished his work on earth (our Lord finished His at the age of thirty-three), and now he has been called to some other task in one of the "many mansions" of the invisible land.

Therefore let us not grieve when God calls away His servants in the midst of a useful career on earth. It is because He has need of them elsewhere. When on Palm Sunday He sent His messengers to the village "over against them" to fetch the ass and colt, He said: "If any man say ought unto you, ye shall say, The Lord hath need of them; and straightway he will send them." Which of us would say No to such a message if it came direct from Him? Yet what is death but our Lord's messenger, to cottage or to palace, saying, "The Lord hath need of him"? And shall we refuse to send the life thus asked for? to give up the "treasure" which the Master wishes to lay up for us in heaven? Nay; we will surrender it, if not with a glad heart, at least with the feeling that it is for the

best. Many a career is thus arrested in the bloom and promise of a bright future on earth, just because that active brain and devoted heart are needed elsewhere.

Thoughts like these must fill our hearts and minds to-day, when we are thinking of our widowed Queen mourning in the solitude of her palace the death of a dear child—a daughter such as few mothers have been blessed with. Some of you, indeed, may think that a Queen cannot be solitary. But grandeur has a solitude of its own which is often much more trying than the solitude of obscurity. Sovereignty is in truth doomed to a loneliness from which the meanest of its subjects is free. The Queen has no equal in all her realm. In her most gracious moods, in her kindliest condescensions, she cannot cease to be a Queen, cannot abolish the impassable barrier which separates sovereign and subject. Think what that fact alone implies. The sympathy of an inferior, however sincere, can never be quite the same as the sympathy of an equal or a superior. Those who envy the wearer of a crown forget the additional sorrows as well as temptations which that high privilege entails. The Queen gave pathetic expression to this feeling of sovereign loneliness when she said that the beginning of her widowhood was "like the beginning of a new reign."

But after all, these partings will not be for long. The generations of men pass over the earth swiftly, one wave of them after another breaking on the shores of eternity. Pass a few years, and the youngest and longest-lived among us will be numbered with the dead. How many generations have passed away since the words of the text were spoken to the sons of Zebedee in Judæa? Every man and woman in those countless generations had their day, as you have yours: their joys and sorrows; their jealousies and rivalries; their hopes and disappointments. But they are all gone; and of all the emotions which stirred them on earth not one avails them now but such as had their roots in heaven; of all the treasures which they so carefully laid up none now remain but such as were laid up where moth and rust cannot corrupt nor thieves break through to steal. The bane of all our earthly pleasures is decay. Our happiness has hardly bloomed ere it begins to fade. Truly they know not what they ask who desire to make their home in such a world, so full of disappointment, and of which, at the best, the tenure is so insecure.

APPENDIX A.

(See p. 82.)

THE regal authority over the Twelve Tribes of Israel, which our Lord promised to His Apostles, is promised in other parts of Holy Scripture to the saints in general, as a prerogative over "the nations." "Do ye not know," says St. Paul, "that the saints shall judge the world?" and it is promised in the Apocalypse that "to him that overcometh, power shall be given over the nations, and he shall share Christ's royal authority."[1] Dr. Doddridge and some other commentators maintain that the passages referred to above mean that the saints shall be "assessors" with Christ in the Day of Judgment. If they mean by this that the saints will approve and assent to the sentence, that would be a mere truism which falls far short of the promise. Spectators in a court of justice are not "assessors" of the judge in any real sense, however much they may approve of his sentence. But if by "assessors" they mean persons having co-ordinate authority with the judge, this is surely trenching on our Lord's Divine prerogative, and has a savour of Socinianism.

The fact, however, is that the idea which we attach to the word "judge" is not its primary idea. The word "judge" suggests to the mind of an English reader simply one whose office it is to try criminals. But this,

[1] See 1 Cor. vi. 3; Rev. ii. 26; iii. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 12.

though included in the idea of the Hebrew word שפט, merely denotes one of its attributes. Its full equivalent is the office of the "judges" in Israel before the institution of the monarchy. The judge in Israel was the theocratic ruler, sometimes uniting the priestly, sometimes the military authority with that of the civil governor. The Lord was their King, and the judge was His vicegerent; and it was therefore an act of rebellion on the part of the Israelites to desire an earthly king. But when they did so it was in these words: "Make us a king to judge us like all the nations. But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us."[1] It is plain from this that the whole royal function is meant, including of course the administration of justice. The root meaning of the word in the original seems to be "a rule," "regulation," "plan," which takes its colour and significance from its subject-matter. The "judgment" of a king was the "manner" of exercising his royal authority; and this is the translation in our Authorized and Revised Versions of the word in 1 Sam. viii. 9, 11, which is usually rendered by the word "judgment." It was the *indoles ipsa regiæ potestatis.* Applied to priests, it was the "due order"[2] of fulfilling the obligations of the Law, or even the violation of the Law if it reached the regularity of a custom.[3] When applied to the Tabernacle or Temple, it was "the fashion of it," or the pattern according to which it was built.[4]

In the language of Holy Scripture, therefore, it would seem that to "judge" often means exercising royalty in the general meaning of the term. So that when it is

[1] 1 Sam. viii. 5, 6. [2] 1 Chron. xv. 13. [3] 1 Sam. ii. 13.
[4] Exod. xxv. 30; 1 Kings vi. 38; Ezek. xlii. 11.

said that "the saints shall judge the world" and "angels," the inference appears to be that the saints are to exercise some regal or viceregal power over "the world" and over "angels." And we must observe, in passing, that in St. Paul's language, and indeed in the language of the New Testament generally, "the saints" is an equivalent expression for Christians—all persons baptized into membership with Christ and thus consecrated to His service, whether they lived worthy of their high calling or not; just as the Jews were called "a holy nation" at the very time when they were denounced by their prophets for their wickedness; the reason being that they were a people consecrated to God's service, as Christians also are, and could not divest themselves of their privileges. But what is meant by "the world," and by the "angels," which Christians are to judge? Our Lord's Apostles were promised "thrones" of regal authority over "the Twelve Tribes of Israel," a prerogative which is promised in other passages of the New Testament to Christians who "overcome" in the strife with evil; but *their* royalty is to have other subjects than the Israelites for its scope.

Certainly the *prima facie* inference from St. Paul's language in 1 Cor. vi. 1–3, would seem to be that he believed that Christians would some day be placed in positions of authority over heathens, whom, apparently, we are to understand by "the world," and over some order of "angels." One class of interpreters find at least a partial interpretation of this in a millennium, or a reign of a thousand years on earth by Christ, when the Apostles would reign over a restored Jewish nation, and "the saints" would reign over the heathen. Others believe that in a future life the heathen who have died without

having had an opportunity of embracing the Gospel, will have a dispensation provided for them in a Second Advent of the Messiah, in which Christians shall reign with Him, but without any determinate period of time.

But all this is mere speculation, and perhaps the part of wisdom is to be patient, and not commit ourselves absolutely to any theory on the subject, lest we fall into the error of the Jews, who "knew not the time of their visitation" because they had adopted a fixed theory of the Messiah which did not correspond with the event. It must be admitted, however, that the belief in a millennial reign of Christ on earth was decidedly prevalent among Christians of the first three centuries; and some language of the New Testament lends itself to the inference that the Incarnation has raised Christians to a higher level than the angels; St. Peter's strong expression, for example, that Christians are "partakers of the Divine nature."

APPENDIX B.

(See p. 94.)

I AM indebted to my friend Canon Badcock for the following table of passages dealing with various words used for the abode of the souls of the departed :—

The word שְׁאוֹל = *Sheol* occurs about sixty-five times in the Old Testment, and is always translated Ἅιδης = *Hades* in the LXX., except where noted below.

Hebrew.	LXX.
Gen. xxxvii. 35	ᾅδης.
„ xlii. 38	„
„ xliv. 29	„
„ „ 31	„
Numb. xvi. 30	„
„ „ 33	„
Deut. xxxii. 22	„
1 Sam. ii. 6	„
2 Sam. xxii. 6	*θάνατου*, LXX., but in Ps. xviii. 6 the word is ᾅδης.
1 Kings ii. 6	ᾅδης.
„ „ 9	„
Job vii. 9	„
„ xi. 8	„
„ xiv. 13	„
„ xvii. 13	„
„ „ 16	„
„ xxi. 13	„
„ xxiv. 19.	The LXX. has a different reading.

Hebrew.	LXX.
Job xxvi. 6	ᾅδης.
Ps. vi. 5	„
„ xvi. 10	„
„ ix. 17	„
„ xviii. 5 (6)	(See above, 2 Sam. xxii. 6.)
„ xxx. 3	ᾅδης.
„ xxxi. 17	„
„ xlix. 14	„
„ „ 15	„
„ lv. 15	„
„ lxxxvi. 13	„
„ lxxxviii. 3	„
„ lxxxix. 48	„
„ cxvi. 3	„
„ cxxxix. 8	„
„ cxli. 7	„
Prov. i. 12	„
„ v. 5	„
„ vii. 27	„
„ ix. 18	„

Hebrew.	LXX.
Prov. xv. 11	ᾅδης.
„ „ 24	„
„ xxiii. 14	ἐκ θάνατου, LXX., "de inferno" (Vulgate).
„ xxvii. 20	ᾅδης.
„ xxx. 16	„
Eccles. ix. 10	„
Cant. viii. 6	„
Isa. v. 14	„
[„ vii. 11. It is a question whether the word is to be read *Sheol* in this verse; but the Vulgate has "in profundum inferni."]	
Isa. xiv. 9	ᾅδης.
„ „ 11	„
Isa. xiv. 15	ᾅδης.
„ xxviii. 15	„
„ „ 18	„
„ xxxviii. 10	„
„ „ 18	„
„ lvii. 9	„
Ezek. xxxi. 15	„
„ „ 16	„
„ „ 17	„
„ xxxii. 21	ἐν βάθει βόθρου, LXX.
„ „ 27	ᾅδης.
Hos. xiii. 14	twice „ See 1 Cor. xv. 55.
Amos ix. 2	ᾅδης.
Jonah ii. 2	„
Hab. ii. 5	„

In the New Testament the word ᾅδης occurs in—

Matt. xi. 23 = Isa. xiv. 15 (*Sheol*).
„ xvi. 18.
Luke x. 15.
„ xvi. 23.
Acts ii. 27, 31 = Ps. xvi. 10 (*Sheol*).
1 Cor. xv. 55. (Textus Receptus ᾅδη and LXX., Hos. xiii. 14, Hades for *Sheol*. Other readings, θάνατε in New Testament.)
Rev. i. 18; iii. 7; vi. 8; xx. 13; xx. 14.

The word עֵדֶן = *Eden* = delight, pleasure.

Hebrew Bible.	Translation of LXX.
Gen. ii. 8	παράδεισον ἐν Ἐδὲμ.
„ „ 10	παράδεισον τῆς τρῦφης.
„ „ 15	ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τῆς τρῦφης.
„ iii. 23	ἐκ τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς.
„ „ 24	τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς.
„ iv. 16	Ἐδέμ.

Hebrew Bible.	Translation of LXX.
Isa. li. 3	*ὡς παράδεισον.*
Jer. li. 34	*ἀπὸ τῆς τρυφῆς μου.*
(Ps. xxxvi. 9	*τῆς τρυφῆς σου.*)
Ezek. xxviii. 13	*ἐν τῇ τρυφῇ τοῦ παραδείσου τοῦ Θεοῦ.*
„ xxxi. 9	*παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς.*
„ „ 16	*τῆς τρυφῆς.*
„ „ 18	*τῆς τρυφῆς.*
„ xxxvi. 35	*κῆπος τρυφῆς.*
Joel ii.	*παράδεισος τρυφῆς.*

גַּן = *gan* = garden—so far as this word appears to be connected with the *garden* of Eden.

Hebrew Bible.	LXX.
Gen. ii. 9	*τοῦ παραδείσου.*
„ „ 10	*τὸν παράδεισον τῆς τρυφῆς*
„ „ 16	*παραδείσῳ.*
„ iii. 1 (2 in LXX.)	*παραδείσου.*
„ „ 2 (3 in LXX.)	*παραδείσου.*
„ „ 8	*παραδείσῳ.*
„ „ 8	*παραδείσου.*
„ „ 10	*παραδείσῳ.*
„ xiii. 10	*ὁ παράδεισος.*
Isa. li. 3	*ὡς παράδεισον Κυρίου.*
Ezek. xxviii. 13	(See under "Eden.")
„ xxxi. 8	*τοῦ παραδείσῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ.*
„ „ 9	(See under "Eden.")
„ xxxvi. 35	(See ditto.)
Joel ii. 3	(See ditto.)

פַּרְדֵּס = *Pardes.* Paradise = a garden of trees, a park.

Hebrew.	LXX.
Cant. iv. 13	*παράδεισος.*
Neh. ii. 8	*τοῦ παραδείσου.*
Eccles. ii. 5	*καὶ παραδείσους.*

In the New Testament—

2 Pet. ii. 4, Ὁ Θεός . . . *σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν.*

In the New Testament—

Παραδείσος: St. Luke xxiii. 43.
2 Cor. xii. 4.
Rev. ii. 7.

In the New Testament—

Γέεννα: Matt. v. 22, 29, 30.
„ x. 28.
„ xviii. 9.
„ xxiii. 15.
„ „ 33.
Mark ix. 43.
„ „ 45.
„ „ 47.
Luke xii. 5.
Jas. iii. 6.

APPENDIX C.

(See p. 108.)

Some commentators deny that this passage includes the idea of spectators. But surely the whole imagery of the passage implies it, as Delitzsch points out—

"In turning our attention to the participial clauses which intervene between the beginning and end of the main sentence, we shall find ourselves justified in the expectation that the figure of a race or athletic contest will not be lost sight of. The first of these clauses sums up the contents of ch. xi., which it makes the motive for the present exhortation: Τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων. As in the semicircle of the theatre spectators sit on crowded benches, tier above tier, to watch the conflict, so have we gathered round about us a νέφος μαρτύρων; a close-pressed, cloud-like multitude of spectators is seated and watching us on each side. . . . One might be tempted to regard μάρτυρες here as simply equivalent to θεαταί (*e.g.* Philo, i. 317. 40), but that would be to overlook the significant use of the expression (μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως) in the former chapter (ch. xi. 2, 4, 5, 39). At the same time, I cannot agree with Lünemann, in dropping the notion of 'spectators' altogether, which is so strongly suggested by the word περικείμενον, transporting us into the midst of the theatre

or the circus, with its ring of eager lookers-on. These, then, are spectators, but also something more; not mere θεαταί, but also μάρτυρες, as those who themselves have borne witness for God when here below, and received His witness, and now act as judges and umpires for us. Once witnesses for God, they are now witnesses of us their brethren: the two notions are closely intertwined, and the sacred author (as Böhme elegantly observes) writes simply μαρτύρων (not μαρτ. τῆς πίστεως), in order not to disturb the significant ambiguity. Averse as we are in general to depart from the simple sense of the text of Scripture for the sake of making out a multitude of meanings, so that the wood at last is hardly to be seen for the trees, we feel that in the present case the double meaning unmistakably obtrudes itself: those who were witnesses of faith in the former chapter are turned by the word περικείμενον into witnesses of us in this; or rather, the two applications of the word μάρτυρες are, in the writer's thought and expression, inextricably combined. The ecclesiastical use of the word *martyr* (blood-witness for God) prevented the Fathers from discerning the application given to it by περικείμενον νέφος here. The clause must, however, be carefully interpreted with reference to the closing words of ch. xi. The heroes of faith whose exploits are over, and who are living now in that heavenly world into which the blood of Jesus has admitted them, are not indifferent spectators of what goes on here; between the Church above and the Church below there is a real and living intercommunion (ch. xii. 22, *sq.*). With this connection of thought the word νέφος, as here applied, gains greatly in significance. Multitudinous saints of departed generations, the spirits of the just made perfect,

visibly overhang the now militant Church, like a thick, impenetrable cloud, which we cannot reach to, but which encompasses us still. How solemn is the warning, yet how gracious the encouragement, contained for us in the thought of the awful session of that august society, the perpetual contemplation of those invisible beholders! Our life here a contest, its theatre the universe, and the seats of the spectators ranged through heaven!"—"Commentary on the Hebrews," pp. 296–298,

APPENDIX D.

(See p. 132.)

In the year 1870 the Synod of Athens sent a letter to Archbishop Tait, saying that the Synod had given instruction to the clergy of Greece to perform the rites of burial and offer the prayers for the departed for any members of the English Church who might die in Greece at a distance from the clergy of their own communion. It was a most friendly act of intercommunion, and was answered in a friendly spirit by Archbishop Tait through his chaplain. Unfortunately, however, this friendly reply contained the *obiter dictum* which forms the subject of the subjoined article. I was at the time, and am still, a member of a clerical society of which the late Dean Stanley was also a member. On his suggestion I wrote a paper on the subject, which was discussed and generally approved of at a meeting of the society. Dean Stanley approved of it so much that he asked Mr. Knowles, then the editor of the *Contemporary Review*, to publish it. I republish it here as a fuller explanation of the views expressed in Sermon VII. I have reason to believe that Archbishop Tait modified his first opinion on this subject.

"The subject of this article has acquired some prominence of late from the indirect condemnation which the Archbishop of Canterbury seems to have passed upon it. In

returning thanks for the kindly intimation of the Synod of Athens that it had instructed the clergy of Greece to perform the rites of burial and offer the usual prayers of their Church on behalf of such English Churchmen as happened to die beyond the reach of their own clergy, the archbishop's chaplain remarked that 'our Church does not sanction such prayers.' Of the wisdom or good feeling of such a statement, on such an occasion, it is not necessary to express any opinion. But the statement itself, if I may venture to say so, seems to me hardly consistent with the facts of the case, and it is with that aspect of it alone that I propose to deal in the remarks which follow. I wish, first of all, to ascertain the mind of the Church of England on the subject; and then, secondly, to consider whether the doctrine is, on its own merits, reprehensible or the reverse.

"With regard to the first point, it is, of course, unnecessary to pass beyond the Reformation period; for everybody knows that the Church of England before the Reformation inculcated and practised prayers for the dead. What, then, was the teaching of the English Reformers?

"The first formal exposition of doctrine put forth by the Reformers was the Ten Articles of 1536, which a few years later were expanded into 'The Institution of a Christian Man.' This careful and elaborate summary of Christian doctrine was published by authority of Convocation in the year 1544, and was the work of a commission consisting of all the bishops of the English Church, eight archdeacons, and seventeen other doctors of divinity, making forty-six in all. The head of the commission was, of course, Archbishop Cranmer. Hugh

Latimer, then Bishop of Worcester, was also a member, and among other names I find that of John Voysey, Bishop of Exeter. On the question of prayers for the dead the 'Institution of a Christian' speaks as follows :—

> Forasmuch as due order of charity requireth, and the Book of Maccabees and divers ancient doctors plainly show, that it is a very good and charitable deed to pray for souls departed; and forasmuch also as such usage hath continued in the Church so many years, even from the beginning, we will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that no man ought to be grieved with the continuance of the same, and that it standeth with the very due order of charity a Christian man to pray for souls departed, and to commit them in our prayers to God's mercy.

"The passage then goes on to say that, inasmuch as Almighty God had not revealed the manner and degree in which the prayers of the Church benefited the souls of the faithful departed, so the Church of England declined to dogmatize on the subject, further than by saying that the doctrine had no necessary connection with 'such abuses as under the name of purgatory hath been advanced.'

"In the same year in which this was published, one of the commissioners, Hugh Latimer, declared, in a sermon before Convocation, that the doctrine of prayers for the dead 'was never lost' from the teaching of the Christian Church.

"The next point I shall take is the Prayer-Book of Edward VI.

"In the Office for the Burial of the Dead, when the priest throws earth upon the corpse, he says, 'I commend thy soul to God the Father Almighty, and thy body to the ground,' etc.

"The next prayer begins thus:—'We commend into Thy hands of mercy, most merciful Father, the soul of this our brother departed, that when the judgment shall come, which Thou hast committed to Thy well-beloved Son, both this our brother and we may be found acceptable in Thy sight, and we may receive that blessing,' etc.

"The next prayer concludes thus:—'Grant, we beseech Thee, that at the day of judgment his soul, and all the souls of Thy elect departed out of this life, may with us, and we with them, fully receive Thy promises, and be made perfect altogether, through the glorious resurrection of Thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.'

"The Second Lesson is followed by some versicles, of which the following are samples: The priest says, with reference to the dead, 'From the gates of hell,' and the congregation reply, 'Deliver their souls, O Lord!'

"Then follows a prayer, in which occurs this petition:—'Grant unto this Thy servant that the sins which he committed in this world be not imputed unto him, but that he, escaping the gates of hell and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the region of light, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the place where is no weeping, sorrow, nor heaviness.'

"This is almost a literal rendering of a prayer in the Apostolical Constitutions, which shows the practice of the Christians of the third century. The prayer is as follows:—

Let us pray for our brethren departed in the faith of Christ, that the most merciful God, who has received the spirits of the deceased, would forgive all their voluntary and involuntary failings; and that, being restored to the Divine favour, they may have a place assigned them in the region of the blessed; in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac,

and Jacob; in the company of those where pain and sorrow and dissatisfaction have no place.

"But I may be told that the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. was superseded by the Second Prayer-Book, from which prayers for the dead were rigidly excluded. My answer to that objection is this: The very authority which published and sanctioned the second book—*i.e.*, Church and Parliament—declared explicitly and emphatically that it was not intended as a condemnation or censure of anything contained in the first book. The Act of Parliament, by which the second book of King Edward was ratified, states that there was nothing in the first book but what was 'agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation.' The Act then goes on to explain 'that such doubts as had been raised in the use and exercise thereof proceeded rather from the curiosity of the minister and mistakers than from any other worthy cause.' This Act of Uniformity bears still stronger testimony to the excellence and orthodoxy of the first book, for it declares that 'by the aid of the Holy Ghost it was with one uniform agreement concluded.'

"I think I am right, therefore, in asserting that in substituting the Prayer-Book of 1552 for that of 1549, the Church of England was as far as possible from refusing her sanction to anything contained in the latter. She expressly guarded against any such inference in the passages which I have just quoted; and therefore the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. cannot be quoted as any argument in favour of the view that the Church of England 'does not sanction' prayers for the dead.

They were excluded under pressure from Calvin, acting on the English Reformers through the boy-king and through Bucer and Peter Martyr, who were then holding positions of considerable influence in England. Calvin's objections to prayers for the dead were natural enough; for they were inconsistent with his doctrine that the great mass of mankind are irrevocably foreordained to eternal damnation, while the small flock of the elect, whose fall was impossible, were privileged to enter heaven as soon as they passed away from earth. But the Church of England has ever instinctively recoiled against the unchristian cruelty of the Calvinistic system, and has never without protest accepted, even temporarily, any of its fundamental tenets.

"The Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. was, of course, abolished on the accession of Queen Mary in 1553. When Queen Elizabeth ascended the throne in 1558 she took immediate steps to restore some of the most important omissions in the Prayer-Book of 1552, and her Primer of 1559, published by authority, contains prayers for the dead. The Marian persecution, however, had caused such an anti-Roman reaction that even the strong Tudor will of Queen Elizabeth could do comparatively little against it. Those who had fled to the Continent during the reign of Mary now returned with soured, and in some cases vengeful, feelings, and thought that it was impossible to rush too far or too fast in a direction opposite to that of Rome. Such a period of feverish excitement was not very favourable to a policy of moderation, and Queen Elizabeth, backed as she was by the support of the old leaders of the Reformation, found it impossible to restore, as she wished to do, the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI .in its

integrity. But all the alterations made were in that direction. The commemoration of the faithful departed was not, however, restored to its old place in the prayer for the Church militant till the last review in 1661.

"The present state of the question, then, so far as the Church of England is concerned, I take to be this. In the years 1536, 1544, and 1549, she gave, freely, deliberately, and publicly her sanction to the doctrine of prayers for the dead, and that sanction she has never since withdrawn. On the only occasion on which she seemed to do so (1552), she was careful to put on record, through the mouths of the spiritual and temporal organs of the nation, a distinct protest that that was not her intention. And, as a matter of fact, prayer for the dead was not altogether excluded even from the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI., though it was certainly reduced to very narrow compass. 'There was one clause,' says the very moderate Wheatley, 'permitted to stand' in the Prayer-Book of 1552, 'viz. in the prayer that immediately follows the Lord's Prayer, in which, till the last review, we prayed that *we* WITH THIS OUR BROTHER, *and all others departed in the true faith of God's holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss.*' He goes on to say, what we all know, that the Puritans at the Savoy Conference objected to the words, 'with this our brother,' not because it implied, as it certainly did, prayers for the dead, but because, in Wheatley's language, 'they did in general object against all that expressed any assurance of the deceased party's happiness, which they did not think proper to be said indifferently over all that died.' The words were therefore, and on that ground only, omitted in the last revision. But Wheatley contends—

That the sentence, as it is still left standing, may well enough be understood to imply the dead as well as the living. For we pray (as it is now) that 'we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of God's holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss;' which is not barely a supposition that all those who are so departed *will* have their perfect consummation and bliss, but a prayer also that they *may* have it, viz., that we with them, and they with us, may be made perfect together, both in body and soul, in the eternal and everlasting glory of God.

"Wheatley then adds a passage (too long to quote) from Bishop Cosin, strongly supporting his own view. Palmer, too—I mean the learned author of the 'Origines' and of the 'Treatise on the Church'—declares that 'the great divines of the English Church' are not opposed to the doctrine, and that 'the Church of England herself has never formally condemned prayers for the dead, but only omitted them in her Liturgy'—an omission which he contends had been partially restored when the reasons which caused the omission were no longer in force.

"I have restricted my quotations to Wheatley and Palmer because they are acknowledged as standard authorities, and are generally recommended by our bishops, I believe, to candidates for ordination. It would be easy to produce a cloud of witnesses in support of Sir W. Palmer's assertion that 'the great divines of the English Church' sanctioned prayers for the dead both by precept and example. Jeremy Taylor, Bishop Bull, Bishop Overall (the author of the sacramental part of our Church Catechism), Thorndyke, Collier, Field, Barrow, Andrewes, and the saintly Wilson and Ken make up a *catena* which might very easily be multiplied. Archbishop Seldon and Bishop Blandford, men of no extreme opinions, confessed that it was their daily practice to pray for the dead; and

Thorndyke and Bishop Barrow beg the prayers of the faithful for their souls in the epitaphs which they left behind them.[1]

"But the exigencies of space compel me to hurry on to my last proof. A few years ago the legality of prayers for the dead came before an English court, and was expressly affirmed by the Dean of the Arches in the case of Woolfrey *v.* Breeks. 'Spes mea Christus. Pray for the soul of J. Woolfrey. It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead.' This was the inscription which originated the trial. The Incumbent refused to admit it into the churchyard on the ground that the Church of England did not sanction prayers for the dead. But the court overruled the objection, and sanctioned the inscription, on the ground (I am quoting the language of the judgment) that it 'was not illegal, as by no canon or

[1] Barrow's epitaph is as follows:—

"Exuviæ Isaaci Asaphensis Episcopi, in manum Domini depositæ, in spem lætæ resurrectionis, per sola Christi merita. O vos transeuntes in domum Domini, domum orationis, orate pro conservo vestro ut inveniat misericordiam in die Domini."

Wheatley, too, left the following epitaph for his own tomb:—

"Reader, join for him in the ejaculation of St. Paul:—The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day."

These epitaphs show not only that their authors believed that the Church of England sanctioned prayers for the dead, but further, Wheatley's belief that Onesiphorus was dead when St. Paul prayed for him, a belief of which a dispassionate consideration of the facts hardly leaves a doubt.

Bishop Heber, a man of moderate opinions, was an advocate for prayers for the departed on Scriptural and Patristic grounds. He writes: "The early Christians, most of them, believed that the condition of such persons" as were in Hades "might be made better, and a milder sentence be obtained for their errors and infirmities from the Almighty Judge by whom the doom of all creatures shall be finally settled." (See his letter in the *Diary of a Lady of Quality*, p. 255.)

authority of the Chruch in these realms had the practice of praying for the dead been expressly prohibited.' In strict law the Church of England sanctioned, and still sanctions, all prayers publicly offered within the precincts of her churchyards. But when the question was put to the test, and an officer of the Church of England attempted to forbid prayers for the dead, and it was decided that he had no power to refuse his sanction, it seems to me extraordinary that any person, at all acquainted with the facts of the case, should commit himself to the untenable position that 'our Church does not sanction such prayers.'

"I hold myself justified in asserting, therefore, that the *dictum* which I have taken as the text of the first part of my subject is historically inaccurate, and is expressly contradicted by an authoritative decision in the Ecclesiastical Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury—a decision never repealed. No incumbent in England could at this moment legally refuse to admit any inscription into his church or churchyard inculcating prayers for the dead on the ground that the Church of England 'does not sanction' it.

"But it does not follow that because the Church of England has never refused to sanction prayers for the dead, such prayers are in themselves right and proper. In order to come to a true conclusion on this head, it is necessary, of course, that we should understand clearly what prayers for the dead mean and imply.

"Now the first observation that an impartial study of the question will suggest to an unprejudiced inquirer is that prayers for the dead are not only coeval with Christianity, but anterior to it. That they are coeval with Christianity it would be easy to prove by a chain of evidence which may be considered demonstrative. This has

never been disputed by any writer of considerable eminence, whatever his own views may have been. Neander freely admits it, and so, though somewhat grudgingly does our own latitudinarian Bishop Burnet. It may not, however, be so well known that the lawfulness and even duty of prayers for the dead has been always allowed and acted on by the Jews. Among a host of witnesses that might be cited in proof of that assertion, I will content myself with the following quotation from Jeremy Taylor:—

> We find, he says, by the history of the Maccabees,[1] that the Jews did pray and make offerings for the dead, which also appears by other testimonies, and by their form of prayers still extant, which they used in the captivity. Now it is very considerable that, given our Blessed Saviour did reprove all the evil doctrines and traditions of the Scribes and Pharisees, and did argue, concerning the dead and the Resurrection, against the Sadducees, yet He spake no word against this public practice, but left it as He found it; which He, who came to declare to us all the will of the Father, would not have done if it had not been innocent, pious, and full of charity.

"I will now assume that I have established these three statements:—(1) That the Church of England has nowhere refused her sanction to prayers for the dead. (2) That such prayers have been sanctioned by the Christian Church from the beginning. (3) That the Christian Church inherited them, with our Lord's tacit sanction,

[1] "For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. And also in that he perceived that there was great favour laid up for those that died godly, it was an holy and good thought. Whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin" (2 Maccabees xii. 44, 45). This attests the practice of the Jews, of which, indeed, we have clear evidence in the ritual of the Temple and Synagogue, in which our Lord must often have joined.

from the Jewish Church. If this be admitted, it follows, I think, that the doctrine is founded on some truth or group of truths, which have their roots in our nature. What are these truths? Let us think for a moment.

"Consider the mass of mankind, and you will find it impossible to accept the Calvinistic theory, which divides the race by an invisible but impassable gulf, even in this life, making it absolutely impossible for those who are on opposite sides ever to exchange positions. If the study of human nature teaches anything certain it is this —that man's eternal happiness results from the development of his nature to the fullest perfection of which it is capable, and that such development is, with God's help, in man's own power. But how few even approximate to that perfection here! Will not the facts of the world around us force home on any thoughtful mind the conviction that the vast majority of mankind pass out of this life with undeveloped characters—far indeed from that perfection of their powers which would enable them to see and enjoy the vision of 'the King in His beauty;' but far, also—blessed be God!—from that utter and hopeless demoralization of character to which Aristotle gives the name of ἀκολασία, and which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews characterizes as past possibility of repentance.

"The question therefore arises, What happens to this multitude of neutral characters when death severs their connection with this life? Our sense of natural justice revolts against the idea of their being eternally lost. Our knowledge of human nature, on the other hand, assures us that such persons could no more enjoy the pure delights of the heavenly life than an ignorant clown

could enjoy himself in a royal drawing-room; and, since human character does not develop *per saltum*, if these persons are ever at all to be 'made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light,' their growth in grace will not cease with the last breath of this earthly life; their training must still go on till they are able to behold the Sun of Righteousness with unclouded eyes.

"The reader's thoughts will, of course, have anticipated my remark that this train of reasoning leads logically to some doctrine of purgatory. It does, and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the case of 'Essays and Reviews,' decided that some kind of purgatory was an admissible doctrine in the Church of England. The purgatory which Mr. Wilson contended for successfully extended, it is true, indefinitely beyond what he calls 'the great adjudication,' but that fact makes no difference to my argument. Now, surely, the fact that the Court of Appeal admitted Mr. Wilson's doctrine of purgatory as compatible with his position as a beneficed clergyman is a conclusive confirmation of the distinction which Dr. Newman drew, in Tract Ninety, between 'the Romish doctrine of purgatory,' censured in the 22nd Article, and any other doctrine of purgatory. And this distinction is still further marked by the fact that in the original form of the Article the doctrine was condemned as 'the doctrine of schoolmen.' As the controversy between the two Churches proceeded, it naturally became more personal, and so for 'the doctrine of schoolmen' was substituted 'the Romish doctrine.' The Article could hardly be aimed at the Tridentine decree on the subject, for that decree did not exist when the Thirty-nine Articles were published. Now what does the

Council of Trent teach on the subject of purgatory? It says this:—'There is a purgatory, and the souls there detained are helped by prayer, and chiefly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar.' Nothing beyond that statement is *de fide* in the Church of Rome. A Roman Catholic is not committed to anything beyond the bare statement that there is a place intermediate between this life and perfect bliss, where imperfect souls are trained for perfection and helped by the prayers of the Church on earth. In a selection from the writings of St. Catherine of Genoa, published by Dr. Manning a few years ago, I find the pains of purgatory explained to mean the flames of Divine love consuming the soul with longings which cannot be satisfied till it is sufficiently purified to be able to enjoy the full fruition of the Godhead. 'When the soul finds itself on its way back,' she says, 'to its first state (of innocence) it is so kindled with the desire of becoming one with God, that this desire becomes its purgatory. . . . The instinct by which it is kindled and the impediment by which it is hindered constitute its purgatory.' That is the thought which permeates and underlies all her views on the subject of purgatory, and her writings have an authoritative place in the Church of Rome.

"Those who are acquainted with Dr. Newman's beautiful 'Dream of Gerontius,' will remember the subjective view which he takes of the pains of purgatory. The guardian angel which bears the soul of Gerontius into the presence-chamber of the Eternal King, thus describes what followed:—

> The eager spirit has darted from my hold,
> And with intemperate energy of love

Flies to the dear feet of Emmanuel;
But, ere it reach them, the keen sanctity,
Which, with its effluence, like a glory, clothes
And circles round the crucified, has seized,
And scorch'd, and shrivell'd it; and now it lies
Passive and still before the awful throne.
O happy, suffering soul; for it is safe,
Consumed, yet quicken'd, by the glance of God.

On coming to itself, the soul is represented as singing a plaintive prayer to be 'taken away' from the ravishing vision of its God to a place of purification:—

There, motionless and happy in my pain,
Lone, not forlorn,—
There will I sing my sad perpetual strain,
Until the morn.
There will I sing, and soothe my stricken breast,
Which ne'er can cease
To throb, and pine, and languish, till possest
Of its Sole Peace.

"Do not let us be frightened by mere words in such way as to discard any truth. Purgatory means a place of purification; and which of the sons of men, except the Son of Man, has ever left this earth so pure as to need no purging before admission to the presence of the all-pure God? Let us rescue words, good in themselves, from any accretion of error that may have gathered round them. This is a wiser plan than to cast them away, with, perchance, some precious truth clinging to them.

"Another truth which underlies the doctrine of prayers for the dead I believe to be this: that the race of man, and pre-eminently the Christian portion of it, is one family, and that death does not and cannot destroy that network of natural interests and sympathies which bind

us together and make us necessary to each other on earth. The great evil of our nature, the cause of nearly all its woes, is selfishness—the repudiation of our family relationship and responsibilities. How does God contrive to cure us of that selfishness? By making us necessary to each other. 'Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.'

"But hardly one of these good gifts is bestowed on man directly from on high. They all reach him through the ministry of his fellows. It is right that no unnecessary obstacles should intervene between the soul of man and its God. But has not Protestantism pushed that principle too far? Goethe thought so, and he was a true interpreter of humanity in that opinion. It is God's will to save men, not as isolated and unconnected units, but as members of a body and common subjects of a holy kingdom; and to bring this great truth home to them He makes them necessary to each other at every turn. In this respect man is more helpless than the brutes that perish. No animal is less self-dependent than he. From the moment he issues from the womb till he is laid in the grave he needs the help of parents, of nurses, of teachers. On the right hand and on the left he has to lean on the arm of his fellowman. Life would be impossible to him without the aid, and would soon become insupportable without the sympathy, of his kind. And lest the migrations of the race should induce men to forget their common origin and the home for which they are destined, the necessity of mutual fellowship pursues them over seas and continents. Each land

has some gifts peculiar to itself which makes it the interest of all nations to be on terms of friendship with one another. And thus a loving Providence makes even our temporal wants subservient to higher purposes, teaching us the impiety of the first murderer's selfish exclamation, and compelling us to see that our true happiness lies in being each his 'brother's keeper.' This principle of mutual interdependence runs through the whole of man's natural life; and it is no less conspicuous in his moral and spiritual life. Nor is it bounded by this earthly scene. Death does not destroy the family relationship of our race. The dead are 'not lost, but gone before,' and constitute, with those still left behind, one family—'the whole family in heaven and in earth,' as St. Paul expresses it. Now what can be so well calculated to keep this truth alive in our minds as the doctrine and practice of praying for the dead? Condemn that doctrine, and then see whether death has indeed 'lost its sting' as you stand by the grave of your beloved!

"The third truth implied in praying for the dead, and the last one which I shall touch on here, may be stated briefly as follows:—The heart of man instinctively refuses to believe in death and to accept it as its natural and final destiny. The heart searches for its vanished kindred, and will not believe that they cease to be, or that its interest in them, or theirs in it, is broken. It is a universal sentiment of humanity; and the more civilized humanity is, the deeper is the sentiment. It is seen in an Old Mortality going up and down the country laboriously renewing the time-worn tombstones of the Covenanters, and in the great orator of Athens, who knew the spell that it contained when he promised victory

to his degenerate countrymen by a passionate adjuration of 'the dead at Marathon.' It is also seen in those legends of many lands which represent some hero or national benefactor as enjoying an immunity from the last debt of humanity; our own Arthur still living in the vale of Avalon, or the great German Kaiser sleeping in his mystic cave till his country shall again need his trusty sword. The fact is, we all pray for the dead—at least all loving hearts do. When our beloved pass away from us we follow them with our longing thoughts, we speculate on their condition in the world unseen, we wish them well. And what is a wish but an unexpressed prayer? 'Every good and holy desire,' says Hooker, 'though it lack the form, hath notwithstanding in itself the substance, and with Him the force of a prayer, who regardeth the very moanings and sighs of the heart of man.' And what is the greatest of our poet-laureate's poems—'In Memoriam,'—but an agonized acknowledgment of the same truth? See, too, how it breaks out of his heart instinctively in his noble ode on the death of the Duke of Wellington—

God accept him; Christ receive him.

Such is the prayer in which he sums up the mute feelings of a nation in grief at the loss of its greatest captain."

APPENDIX E.

(See p. 165.)

THE following account (sent to the *Philosophical Transactions* by the operator) of the recovery of sight by a person born blind, supplies an interesting confirmation of the illustration which I have used on p. 165 :—

"*Observations made by Mr. Chesselden on a young gentleman who was born blind, or lost his sight so early that he had no recollection of ever having seen, and was couched between thirteen and fourteen years of age.*

"When he first saw, he was so far from making any judgment about distances, that he thought all objects whatever touched his eyes (as he expressed it), as what he felt did his skin; and thought no objects so agreeable as those which were smooth and regular, though he could form no judgment of their shape, or guess what it was in any object that was pleasing to him. He knew not the shape of anything, nor any one thing from another. But upon being told what things were which he knew before from feeling, he would carefully observe, that he might know them again; but having too many objects to learn at once, he forgot many of them, and, as he said at first, learnt to know, and forgot again, a thousand things in a day. One particular I will relate. Having often forgotten which was the cat and which the dog, he was ashamed to ask; but catching

the cat (which he knew by feeling), he was observed to look at her steadfastly, and then setting her down, said, 'So, puss! I shall know you another time.'

"He was very much surprised that those things which he had liked best did not appear most agreeable in his eyes, expecting those persons would appear most beautiful whom he loved most, and such things to be most agreeable to his sight that were so to his taste. We thought he soon knew what pictures represented, but we found afterwards we were mistaken; for about two months after he was couched he discovered all at once that they represented solid bodies, whereas to that time he considered them only as parti-coloured planes, or surfaces diversified with variety of paint. But even then he was no less surprised, expecting the pictures would feel like the things they represented, and was amazed when he found those parts which, by their light and shadow, appeared round and uneven, felt flat like the rest; and he asked which was the *lying* sense—feeling or seeing?

"Being shown his father's picture in a locket at his mother's watch, and told what it was, he acknowledged it a likeness, but was vastly surprised, asking how it could be that a large face should be expressed in so little room, saying it should have seemed as impossible as to put a bushel of anything into a pint. At first he could bear but very little sight, and the things he saw he thought extremely large; but on seeing things larger, those first seen he conceived less, never being able to imagine any lines beyond the bounds he saw. The room he was in, he said, he knew to be part of the house, yet he could not conceive that the whole house could look bigger. Before he was couched he expected little advantage from seeing worth undergoing an

operation for, except reading and writing; for he said he thought he could have no more pleasure in walking abroad than he had in the garden, which he could do very safely and readily. And even blindness, he observed, had this advantage—that he could go anywhere in the dark much better than those who can see. And after he had seen, he did not soon lose this quality, nor desire a light to go about in the house in the night. He said every new object was a new delight, and the pleasure was so great that he wanted ways to express it. But his gratitude to his operator he could not conceal, never seeing him for some time without tears of joy in his eyes, and other marks of affection; and if he did not happen to come at any time when he was expected, he would be so grieved that he could not forbear crying at his disappointment.

"A year after first seeing, being carried upon Epsom Downs, and observing a large prospect, he was exceedingly delighted with it, and called it a new kind of seeing.

"And now, being lately couched of his other eye, he says that objects at first appeared large to this eye, but not so large as they did at first to the other; and looking upon the same object with both eyes, he thought it looked about twice as large as with the first-couched eye only, but not double, that we can discover."

Does not this show very plainly the possibility of our living in a series of worlds quite close to us, of which, nevertheless, we may be totally ignorant, because we lack the necessary organs for apprehending them? This blind man possessed dormant senses, of which he knew nothing till he had submitted to a painful operation; and he could not even conceive the manifold beauties to which that operation would introduce him. Indeed, his very blindness

seemed to him an advantage, since it enabled him to find his way in the dark better than those who could see. Is not this the case of the mass of men in regard to the spiritual world? Their organs of spiritual perception are now dormant: they cannot even conceive the things which God has prepared for them that love Him; and their present state of spiritual blindness seems to them so preferable to the lot of "the children of light," that they think they would be making a foolish choice in undergoing pain or discomfort for the sake of what now seems to them so problematical a benefit. How instructive, too, is Chesselden's account of the gradual acquisition of sight by his patient! Does it not remind us of the similar experience of the man in the Gospel, who, on receiving his sight, "saw men as trees, walking"? It is one of those casual touches of nature which are so plentifully scattered over the Gospels, and which attest their genuineness better than evidence of a more direct character.

APPENDIX F.

(See p. 210.)

"I HAVE said that in one respect my mind has changed during the last twenty or thirty years. Up to the age of thirty, or beyond it, poetry of many kinds, such as the works of Milton, Gray, Byron, Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Shelley, gave me great pleasure, and even as a schoolboy I took intense delight in Shakespeare, especially in the historical plays. I have also said that formerly pictures gave me considerable, and music very great, delight. But now for many years I cannot endure to read a line of poetry. I have tried lately to read Shakespeare, and found it so intolerably dull that it nauseated me. I have also almost lost my taste for pictures or music. Music generally sets me thinking too energetically on what I have been at work on, instead of giving me pleasure. I retain some taste for fine scenery, but it does not cause me the exquisite delight which it formerly did. . . . This curious and lamentable loss of the higher æsthetic tastes is all the odder, as books on history, biographies, travels (independently of any scientific facts which they may contain), and essays on all sorts of subjects, interest me as much as ever they did. My mind seems to have become a kind of machine for grinding general laws out of large collections of facts; but why this should have caused the atrophy of that part of the brain alone, on

which the higher tastes depend, I cannot conceive."—"Life and Letters of Charles Darwin," vol. i. pp. 100, 101.

On pp. 125, 126 of the same volume some almost ludicrous instances are given of the complete extinction of the æsthetic taste in Darwin's mind. "When he was looking at the Turners in Ruskin's bedroom," "he could make out absolutely nothing of what Ruskin saw in them," "and said that a photograph was worth any number of pictures, as if he were blind to the artistic quality in a painted portrait." What a revelation! But a student of natural history, like Darwin, ought not to have been puzzled by this atrophy of his higher nature, for it is one of the established laws of physical science that an unused organ or faculty gradually withers, and finally dies; and it is a very old truth in spiritual science (Matt. xiii. 12), Ὅστις δὲ οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ; *i.e.* he who has not used his gift—has not acquired the habit (ἕξις) of it—shall lose it eventually; whereas he who has exercised his talent will increase it thereby. This melancholy confession of Darwin shows the natural tendency of an exclusive study of physical science to deaden the higher and more spiritual faculties.

THE END.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED, LONDON AND BECCLES.

A Selection of Works

IN

THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

PUBLISHED BY

MESSRS. LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

London: 39 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

New York: 91 and 93 FIFTH AVENUE.

Bombay: 32 HORNBY ROAD.

Abbey and Overton.—THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By CHARLES J. ABBEY, M.A., Rector of Checkendon, Reading, and JOHN H. OVERTON, D.D., Canon of Lincoln. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Adams.—SACRED ALLEGORIES. The Shadow of the Cross—The Distant Hills—The Old Man's Home—The King's Messengers. By the Rev. WILLIAM ADAMS, M.A. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

The four Allegories may be had separately, with Illustrations. *16mo. 1s. each.*

Aids to the Inner Life.

Edited by the Venble. W. H. HUTCHINGS, M.A., Archdeacon of Cleveland, Canon of York, Rector of Kirby Misperton, and Rural Dean of Malton. *Five Vols. 32mo, cloth limp, 6d. each; or cloth extra, 1s. each.*

OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. By THOMAS À KEMPIS.
THE CHRISTIAN YEAR
THE DEVOUT LIFE. By ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.
THE HIDDEN LIFE OF THE SOUL.
THE SPIRITUAL COMBAT. By LAURENCE SCUPOLI.

Alexander.—THE CHRISTIANITY OF ST. PAUL. By the Rev. S. A. ALEXANDER, M.A., Reader of the Temple Church. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

Barnett.—THE SERVICE OF GOD: Sermons, Essays, and Addresses. By SAMUEL A. BARNETT, Warden of Toynbee Hall, Whitechapel; Canon of Bristol Cathedral; Select Preacher before Oxford University. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Bathe.—Works by the Rev. ANTHONY BATHE, M.A.

A LENT WITH JESUS. A Plain Guide for Churchmen. Containing Readings for Lent and Easter Week, and on the Holy Eucharist. *32mo, 1s.; or in paper cover, 6d.*

AN ADVENT WITH JESUS. *32mo, 1s.; or in paper cover, 6d.*

WHAT I SHOULD BELIEVE. A Simple Manual of Self-Instruction for Church People. *Small 8vo, limp, 1s.; cloth gilt, 2s.*

Bathe and Buckham.—THE CHRISTIAN'S ROAD BOOK. 2 Parts. By the Rev. ANTHONY BATHE and Rev. F. H. BUCKHAM.

Part I. DEVOTIONS. *Sewed, 6d.; limp cloth, 1s.; cloth extra, 1s. 6d.*

Part II. READINGS. *Sewed, 1s.; limp cloth, 2s.; cloth extra, 3s.; or complete in one volume, sewed, 1s. 6d.; limp cloth, 2s. 6d.; cloth extra, 3s. 6d.*

Benson.—Works by the Rev. R. M. BENSON, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford.

THE FINAL PASSOVER: A Series of Meditations upon the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ. *Small* 8*vo.*

Vol. I.—THE REJECTION. 5*s.*
Vol. II.—THE UPPER CHAMBER.
Part I. 5*s.*
Part II. 5*s.*
Vol. III.—THE DIVINE EXODUS.
Parts I. and II. 5*s.* each.
Vol. IV.—THE LIFE BEYOND THE GRAVE. 5*s.*

THE MAGNIFICAT; a Series of Meditations upon the Song of the Blessed Virgin Mary. *Small* 8*vo.* 2*s.*

SPIRITUAL READINGS FOR EVERY DAY. 3 *vols. Small* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each.*

I. ADVENT. II. CHRISTMAS. III. EPIPHANY.

BENEDICTUS DOMINUS: A Course of Meditations for Every Day of the Year. Vol. I.—ADVENT TO TRINITY. Vol. II.—TRINITY, SAINTS' DAYS, etc. *Small* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each*; *or in One Volume*, 7*s.*

BIBLE TEACHINGS: The Discourse at Capernaum.—St. John vi. *Small* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE WISDOM OF THE SON OF DAVID: An Exposition of the First Nine Chapters of the Book of Proverbs. *Small* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE MANUAL OF INTERCESSORY PRAYER. *Royal* 32*mo.*; *cloth boards*, 1*s.* 3*d.*; *cloth limp*, 9*d.*

THE EVANGELIST LIBRARY CATECHISM. Part I. *Small* 8*vo.* 3*s.*

PAROCHIAL MISSIONS. *Small* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Bigg.—UNITY IN DIVERSITY: Five Addresses delivered in the Cathedral Church of Christ, Oxford, during Lent 1899, with Introduction. By the Rev. CHARLES BIGG, D.D., Rector of Fenny Compton, formerly Senior Student and Tutor of Christ Church. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Bickersteth.—YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER: a Poem in Twelve Books. By EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, D.D., Lord Bishop of Exeter. *One Shilling Edition*, 18*mo. With red borders*, 16*mo*, 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Crown 8*vo Edition* (5*s.*) *may still be had.*

Blunt.—Works by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, D.D.

THE ANNOTATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER: Being an Historical, Ritual, and Theological Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England. 4*to.* 21*s.*

THE COMPENDIOUS EDITION OF THE ANNOTATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER: Forming a concise Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England. *Crown* 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

Blunt.—Works by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, D.D.—*contd.*

DICTIONARY OF DOCTRINAL AND HISTORICAL THEOLOGY. By various Writers. *Imperial 8vo.* 21*s.*

DICTIONARY OF SECTS, HERESIES, ECCLESIASTICAL PARTIES AND SCHOOLS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. By various Writers. *Imperial 8vo.* 21*s.*

THE REFORMATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND: its History, Principles, and Results. 1574-1662. *Two Vols. 8vo.* 34*s.*

THE BOOK OF CHURCH LAW. Being an Exposition of the Legal Rights and Duties of the Parochial Clergy and the Laity of the Church of England. Revised by the Right Hon. Sir WALTER G. F. PHILLIMORE, Bart., D.C.L., and G. EDWARDES JONES, Barrister-at-Law. *Crown 8vo.* 9*s.*

A COMPANION TO THE BIBLE: Being a Plain Commentary on Scripture History, to the end of the Apostolic Age. *Two Vols. small 8vo. Sold separately.* OLD TEST. 3*s.* 6*d.* NEW TEST. 3*s.* 6*d.*

HOUSEHOLD THEOLOGY: a Handbook of Religious Information respecting the Holy Bible, the Prayer Book, the Church, etc., etc. *Paper cover, 16mo.* 1*s.* *Also the Larger Edition,* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Body.—Works by the Rev. GEORGE BODY, D.D., Canon of Durham.

THE LIFE OF LOVE. A Course of Lent Lectures. *16mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE SCHOOL OF CALVARY; or, Laws of Christian Life revealed from the Cross. *16mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE LIFE OF JUSTIFICATION. *16mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE LIFE OF TEMPTATION. *16mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE FAITHFUL DEPARTED. *Small 8vo. sewed,* 6*d.* *32mo. cloth,* 1*s.*

Boultbee.—A COMMENTARY ON THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. T. P. BOULTBEE, formerly Principal of the London College of Divinity, St. John's Hall, Highbury. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

Bright.—Works by WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

SOME ASPECTS OF PRIMITIVE CHURCH LIFE. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

THE ROMAN SEE IN THE EARLY CHURCH: And other Studies in Church History. *Crown 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

WAYMARKS IN CHURCH HISTORY. *Crown 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

LESSONS FROM THE LIVES OF THREE GREAT FATHERS. St. Athanasius, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

THE INCARNATION AS A MOTIVE POWER. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

Bright and Medd.—LIBER PRECUM PUBLICARUM ECCLESIÆ ANGLICANÆ. A GULIELMO BRIGHT, S.T.P., et PETRO GOLDSMITH MEDD, A.M., Latine redditus. *Small 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Browne.—WEARIED WITH THE BURDEN: A Book of Daily Readings for Lent. By ARTHUR HEBER BROWNE, M.A., LL.D., late Rector of St. John's, Newfoundland. *Crown 8vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

Browne.—AN EXPOSITION OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, Historical and Doctrinal. By E. H. BROWNE, D.D., sometime Bishop of Winchester. *8vo.* 16*s.*

Campion and Beamont.—THE PRAYER BOOK INTERLEAVED. With Historical Illustrations and Explanatory Notes arranged parallel to the Text. By W. M. CAMPION, D.D., and W. J. BEAMONT, M.A. *Small 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Carter.—Works by, and edited by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

THE SPIRIT OF WATCHFULNESS AND OTHER SERMONS. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

THE TREASURY OF DEVOTION: a Manual of Prayer for General and Daily Use. Compiled by a Priest.
18*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*; *cloth limp*, 2*s.* Bound with the Book of Common Prayer, 3*s.* 6*d.* Red-Line Edition. *Cloth extra, gilt top.* 18*mo*, 2*s.* 6*d. net.* Large-Type Edition. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE WAY OF LIFE: A Book of Prayers and Instruction for the Young at School, with a Preparation for Confirmation. Compiled by a Priest, 18*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

THE PATH OF HOLINESS: a First Book of Prayers, with the Service of the Holy Communion, for the Young. Compiled by a Priest. With Illustrations. 16*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*; *cloth limp*, 1*s.*

THE GUIDE TO HEAVEN: a Book of Prayers for every Want. (For the Working Classes.) Compiled by a Priest. 18*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*; *cloth limp*, 1*s. Large-Type Edition. Crown 8vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*; *cloth limp*, 1*s.*

THE STAR OF CHILDHOOD: a First Book of Prayers and Instruction for Children. Compiled by a Priest. With Illustrations. 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

SIMPLE LESSONS; or, Words Easy to be Understood. A Manual of Teaching. I. On the Creed. II. The Ten Commandments. III. The Sacrament. 18*mo.* 3*s.*

A BOOK OF PRIVATE PRAYER FOR MORNING, MID-DAY, AND OTHER TIMES. 18*mo. limp cloth*, 1*s.*; *cloth, red edges*, 1*s.* 3*d.*

NICHOLAS FERRAR: his Household and his Friends. With Portrait engraved after a Picture by CORNELIUS JANSSEN at Magdalene College, Cambridge. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

MANUAL OF DEVOTION FOR SISTERS OF MERCY. 8 parts in 2 vols. 32mo. 10*s.* Or separately:—Part I. 1*s.* 6*d.* Part II. 1*s.* Part III. 1*s.* Part IV. 2*s.* Part V. 1*s.* Part VI. 1*s.* Part VII. Part VIII. 1*s.* 6*d.*

HARRIET MONSELL: A Memoir of the First Mother Superior of the Clewer Community. With Portrait. *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

PARISH TEACHINGS. First and Second Series. *Crown 8vo.* 4*s.* 6*d. each sold separately.*

SPIRITUAL INSTRUCTIONS. *Crown 8vo.*

THE HOLY EUCHARIST. 3*s.* 6*d.*
THE DIVINE DISPENSATIONS. 3*s.* 6*d.*
THE LIFE OF GRACE. 3*s.* 6*d.*
OUR LORD'S EARLY LIFE. 3*s.* 6*d.*
OUR LORD'S ENTRANCE ON HIS MINISTRY. 3*s.* 6*d.*
THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Carter.—Works by, and edited by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.—*continued.*

THE DOCTRINE OF THE PRIESTHOOD IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. *Crown 8vo.* 4*s.*

THE DOCTRINE OF CONFESSION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST, drawn from the Holy Scriptures and the Records of the Church of England. *Fcp. 8vo.* 9*d.*

VOWS AND THE RELIGIOUS STATE. *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.*

Coles.—LENTEN MEDITATIONS. By the Rev. V. S. S. COLES, M.A., Principal of the Pusey House, Oxford. *18mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Congreve.—CHRISTIAN LIFE A RESPONSE. With other Retreat Addresses and Sermons. By GEORGE CONGREVE, Mission Priest of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley St. John, Oxford. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

Conybeare and Howson.—THE LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE, M.A., and the Very Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D. With numerous Maps and Illustrations.

LIBRARY EDITION. *Two Vols. 8vo.* 21*s.* STUDENTS' EDITION. *One Vol. Crown 8vo.* 6*s.* POPULAR EDITION. *One Vol. Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Creighton.—A HISTORY OF THE PAPACY FROM THE GREAT SCHISM TO THE SACK OF ROME (1378-1527). By Right Hon. and Right Rev. MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D., Lord Bishop of London. *Six volumes. Crown 8vo.* 6*s. each.*

DAY-HOURS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, THE. Newly Revised according to the Prayer Book and the Authorised Translation of the Bible. *Crown 8vo. sewed,* 3*s.* ; *cloth,* 3*s.* 6*d.*

SUPPLEMENT TO THE DAY-HOURS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, being the Service for certain Holy Days. *Crown 8vo. sewed,* 3*s.* ; *cloth,* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Devotional Series, 16mo, Red Borders. *Each* 2*s.* 6*d.*

BICKERSTETH'S YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.
CHILCOT'S TREATISE ON EVIL THOUGHTS.
THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.
HERBERT'S POEMS AND PROVERBS.
KEMPIS' (À) OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.
LEAR'S (H. L. SIDNEY) FOR DAYS AND YEARS.
FRANCIS DE SALES' (ST.) THE DEVOUT LIFE.
WILSON'S THE LORD'S SUPPER. *Large type.*
*TAYLOR'S (JEREMY) HOLY LIVING.
*——— ——— HOLY DYING.

* *These two in one Volume.* 5*s.*

Devotional Series, 18mo, without Red Borders. *Each* 1*s.*

BICKERSTETH'S YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.
THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.
KEMPIS' (À) OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.
HERBERT'S POEMS AND PROVERBS.
WILSON'S THE LORD'S SUPPER. *Large type.*
FRANCIS DE SALES' (ST.) THE DEVOUT LIFE.
*TAYLOR'S (JEREMY) HOLY LIVING.
*——— ——— HOLY DYING.

* *These two in one Volume.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Edersheim.—Works by ALFRED EDERSHEIM, M.A., D.D., Ph.D.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JESUS THE MESSIAH. *Two Vols.* 8*vo.* 24*s.*

JESUS THE MESSIAH: being an Abridged Edition of 'The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.' *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

HISTORY OF THE JEWISH NATION AFTER THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM UNDER TITUS. 8*vo.* 18*s.*

Ellicott.—Works by C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester.

A CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES. Greek Text, with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary, and a Revised English Translation. 8*vo.*

GALATIANS. 8*s.* 6*d.*
EPHESIANS. 8*s.* 6*d.*
PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS, AND PHILEMON. 10*s.* 6*d.*
THESSALONIANS. 7*s.* 6*d.*
PASTORAL EPISTLES. 10*s.* 6*d.*

HISTORICAL LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. 8*vo.* 12*s.*

ENGLISH (THE) CATHOLIC'S VADE MECUM: a Short Manual of General Devotion. Compiled by a PRIEST. 32*mo. limp,* 1*s.*; *cloth,* 2*s.*

PRIEST'S Edition. 32*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

Epochs of Church History.—Edited by Right Hon. and Right Rev. MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D., Lord Bishop of London. *Small* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d. each.*

THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN OTHER LANDS. By the Rev. H. W. TUCKER, M.A.
THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. By the Rev. GEO. G. PERRY, M.A.
THE CHURCH OF THE EARLY FATHERS. By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.
THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By the Rev. J. H. OVERTON, D.D.
THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. By the Hon. G. C. BRODRICK, D.C.L.
THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE. By J. BASS MULLINGER, M.A.
THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By the Rev. W. HUNT, M.A.
THE CHURCH AND THE EASTERN EMPIRE. By the Rev. H. F. TOZER, M.A.
THE CHURCH AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE. By the Rev. A. CARR, M.A.
THE CHURCH AND THE PURITANS, 1570-1660. By HENRY OFFLEY WAKEMAN M.A.
HILDEBRAND AND HIS TIMES. By the Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, M.A.
THE POPES AND THE HOHENSTAUFEN. By UGO BALZANI.
THE COUNTER REFORMATION. By ADOLPHUS WILLIAM WARD, Litt.D.
WYCLIFFE AND MOVEMENTS FOR REFORM. By REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A.
THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY. By the Rev. H. M. GWATKIN, M.A.

EUCHARISTIC MANUAL (THE). Consisting of Instructions and Devotions for the Holy Sacrament of the Altar. From various sources. 32*mo. cloth gilt, red edges.* 1*s. Cheap Edition, limp cloth.* 9*d.*

Farrar.—Works by FREDERICK W. FARRAR, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.

THE BIBLE: Its Meaning and Supremacy. *8vo.* 15*s.*

TEXTS EXPLAINED; or, Helps to Understand the New Testament. *Crown 8vo.* [*In the press.*

ALLEGORIES. With 25 Illustrations by AMELIA BAUERLE. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

Fosbery.—Works edited by the Rev. THOMAS VINCENT FOSBERY, M.A., sometime Vicar of St. Giles's, Reading.

VOICES OF COMFORT. *Cheap Edition. Small 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*
The Larger Edition (7s. 6d.) may still be had.

HYMNS AND POEMS FOR THE SICK AND SUFFERING. In connection with the Service for the Visitation of the Sick. Selected from Various Authors. *Small 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Geikie.—Works by J. CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D., LL.D., late Vicar of St. Martin-at-Palace, Norwich.

HOURS WITH THE BIBLE: the Scriptures in the Light of Modern Discovery and Knowledge. *New Edition, largely rewritten. Complete in Twelve Volumes. Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each.*

OLD TESTAMENT.

In Six Volumes. Sold separately. 3*s.* 6*d. each.*

CREATION TO THE PATRIARCHS. *With a Map and Illustrations.*

MOSES TO JUDGES. *With a Map and Illustrations.*

SAMSON TO SOLOMON. *With a Map and Illustrations.*

REHOBOAM TO HEZEKIAH. *With Illustrations.*

MANASSEH TO ZEDEKIAH. With the Contemporary Prophets. *With a Map and Illustrations.*

EXILE TO MALACHI. With the Contemporary Prophets. *With Illustrations.*

NEW TESTAMENT.

In Six Volumes. Sold separately. 3*s.* 6*d. each.*

THE GOSPELS. *With a Map and Illustrations.*

LIFE AND WORDS OF CHRIST. *With Map.* 2 *vols.*

LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. *With Maps and Illustrations.* 2 *vols.*

ST. PETER TO REVELATION. *With 29 Illustrations.*

LIFE AND WORDS OF CHRIST.

Cabinet Edition. With Map. 2 *vols. Post 8vo.* 7*s.*

Cheap Edition, without the Notes. 1 *vol. 8vo.* 5*s.*

A SHORT LIFE OF CHRIST. *With Illustrations. Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*; *gilt edges,* 4*s.* 6*d.*

GOLD DUST: a Collection of Golden Counsels for the Sanctification of Daily Life. Translated and abridged from the French by E.L.E.E. Edited by CHARLOTTE M. YONGE. Parts I. II. III. Small Pocket Volumes. *Cloth, gilt, each* 1*s.* Parts I. and II. in One Volume. 1*s.* 6*d.* Parts I., II., and III. in One Volume. 2*s.*

*** The two first parts in One Volume, *large type*, 18*mo. cloth, gilt.* 2*s.* 6*d.* Parts I. II. and III. are also supplied, bound in white cloth, with red edges, in box, price 3*s.*

Gore.—Works by the Rev. CHARLES GORE, M.A., D.D., Canon of Westminster.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

ROMAN CATHOLIC CLAIMS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

GREAT TRUTHS OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. Edited by the Rev. W. U. RICHARDS. *Small* 8*vo.* 2*s.*

Hall.—Works by the Right Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., Bishop of Vermont.

THE VIRGIN MOTHER: Retreat Addresses on the Life of the Blessed Virgin Mary as told in the Gospels. With an appended Essay on the Virgin Birth of our Lord. *Crown* 8*vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

CHRIST'S TEMPTATION AND OURS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Hall.—THE KENOTIC THEORY. Considered with Particular Reference to its Anglican Forms and Arguments. By the Rev. FRANCIS J. HALL, D.D., Instructor of Dogmatic Theology in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

HALLOWING OF SORROW, THE. By E. R. With a Preface by H. S. HOLLAND, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's. *Small* 8*vo.* 2*s.*

Harrison.—Works by the Rev. ALEXANDER J. HARRISON, B.D., Lecturer of the Christian Evidence Society.

PROBLEMS OF CHRISTIANITY AND SCEPTICISM. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

THE CHURCH IN RELATION TO SCEPTICS: a Conversational Guide to Evidential Work. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE REPOSE OF FAITH, IN VIEW OF PRESENT DAY DIFFICULTIES. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Hatch.—THE ORGANIZATION OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCHES. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1880. By EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D., late Reader in Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford. 8*vo.* 5*s.*

Heygate.—THE MANUAL: a Book of Devotion. Adapted for General Use. By the Rev. W. E. HEYGATE, M.A., Rector of Brighstone. 18*mo. cloth limp*, 1*s.*; *boards*, 1*s.* 3*d.* *Cheap Edition*, 6*d.* *Small* 8*vo. Large Type*, 1*s.* 6*d.*

Holland.—Works by the Rev. HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's.

GOD'S CITY AND THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM. *Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

PLEAS AND CLAIMS FOR CHRIST. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

CREED AND CHARACTER: Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

ON BEHALF OF BELIEF. Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

CHRIST OR ECCLESIASTES. Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

LOGIC AND LIFE, with other Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Hollings.—Works by the Rev. G. S. HOLLINGS, Mission Priest of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley, Oxford.

THE HEAVENLY STAIR; or, A Ladder of the Love of God for Sinners. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

PORTA REGALIS; or, Considerations on Prayer. *Crown 8vo. limp cloth, 1s. 6d. net; cloth boards, 2s. net.*

MEDITATIONS ON THE DIVINE LIFE, THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, AND THE TRANSFIGURATION. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. Suggested by Passages in the Collects for the Sundays in Lent. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE WISDOM OF GOD. *Crown 8vo. 4s.*

PARADOXES OF THE LOVE OF GOD, especially as they are seen in the way of the Evangelical Counsels. *Crown 8vo. 4s.*

ONE BORN OF THE SPIRIT; or, the Unification of our Life in God. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Hutchings.—Works by the Ven. W. H. HUTCHINGS, M.A. Archdeacon of Cleveland, Canon of York, Rector of Kirby Misperton, and Rural Dean of Malton.

SERMON SKETCHES from some of the Sunday Lessons throughout the Church's Year. *Vols. I and II. Crown 8vo. 5s. each.*

THE LIFE OF PRAYER: a Course of Lectures delivered in All Saints Church, Margaret Street, during Lent. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

THE PERSON AND WORK OF THE HOLY GHOST: a Doctrinal and Devotional Treatise. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

SOME ASPECTS OF THE CROSS. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

THE MYSTERY OF THE TEMPTATION. Lent Lectures delivered a St. Mary Magdalene, Paddington. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

Hutton.—THE CHURCH OF THE SIXTH CENTURY. Six Chapters in Ecclesiastical History. By WILLIAM HOLDEN HUTTON, B.D., Birkbeck Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History, Trinity College, Cambridge. *With* 11 *Illustrations. Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Hutton.—THE SOUL HERE AND HEREAFTER. By the Rev. R. E. HUTTON, Chaplain of St. Margaret's, East Grinstead. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

INHERITANCE OF THE SAINTS; or, Thoughts on the Communion of Saints and the Life of the World to come. Collected chiefly from English Writers by L. P. With a Preface by the Rev. HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A. *Seventh Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Jameson.—Works by Mrs. JAMESON.

SACRED AND LEGENDARY ART, containing Legends of the Angels and Archangels, the Evangelists, the Apostles. With 19 Etchings and 187 Woodcuts. 2 *vols.* 8*vo.* 20*s. net.*

LEGENDS OF THE MONASTIC ORDERS, as represented in the Fine Arts. With 11 Etchings and 88 Woodcuts. 8*vo.* 10*s. net.*

LEGENDS OF THE MADONNA, OR BLESSED VIRGIN MARY. With 27 Etchings and 165 Woodcuts. 8*vo.* 10*s. net.*

THE HISTORY OF OUR LORD, as exemplified in Works of Art. Commenced by the late Mrs. JAMESON; continued and completed by LADY EASTLAKE. With 31 Etchings and 281 Woodcuts. 2 *Vols.* 8*vo.* 20*s. net.*

Jennings.—ECCLESIA ANGLICANA. A History of the Church of Christ in England from the Earliest to the Present Times. By the Rev. ARTHUR CHARLES JENNINGS, M.A. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Jukes.—Works by ANDREW JUKES.

THE NEW MAN AND THE ETERNAL LIFE. Notes on the Reiterated Amens of the Son of God. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

THE NAMES OF GOD IN HOLY SCRIPTURE: a Revelation of His Nature and Relationships. *Crown* 8*vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

THE TYPES OF GENESIS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

THE SECOND DEATH AND THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE ORDER AND CONNEXION OF THE CHURCH'S TEACHING, as set forth in the arrangement of the Epistles and Gospels throughout the Year. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE CHRISTIAN HOME. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Knox Little.—Works by W. J. KNOX LITTLE, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Worcester, and Vicar of Hoar Cross.

THE PERFECT LIFE: Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVES OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Ten Sermons preached in Manchester Cathedral, in Lent and Advent. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

SERMONS PREACHED FOR THE MOST PART IN MANCHESTER. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE MYSTERY OF THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

THE LIGHT OF LIFE. Sermons preached on Various Occasions. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

SUNLIGHT AND SHADOW IN THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Sermons preached for the most part in America. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Lear.—Works by, and Edited by, H. L. SIDNEY LEAR.

FOR DAYS AND YEARS. A book containing a Text, Short Reading, and Hymn for Every Day in the Church's Year. *16mo. 2s. 6d. Also a Cheap Edition, 32mo. 1s.; or cloth gilt, 1s. 6d.; or with red borders, 2s. 6d.*

FIVE MINUTES. Daily Readings of Poetry. *16mo. 3s. 6d. Also a Cheap Edition, 32mo. 1s.; or cloth gilt, 1s. 6d.*

WEARINESS. A Book for the Languid and Lonely. *Large Type. Small 8vo. 5s.*

JOY: A FRAGMENT. With a slight sketch of the Author's life. *Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHIES. *Nine Vols. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.*

MADAME LOUISE DE FRANCE, Daughter of Louis XV., known also as the Mother Térèse de St. Augustin.

A DOMINICAN ARTIST: a Sketch of the Life of the Rev. Père Besson, of the Order of St. Dominic.

HENRI PERREYVE. By PÈRE GRATRY.

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES, Bishop and Prince of Geneva.

THE REVIVAL OF PRIESTLY LIFE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY IN FRANCE.

A CHRISTIAN PAINTER OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BOSSUET AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

FÉNELON, ARCHBISHOP OF CAMBRAI.

HENRI DOMINIQUE LACORDAIRE.

[*continued.*

Lear. — Works by, and Edited by, H. L. SIDNEY LEAR — *continued.*

DEVOTIONAL WORKS. Edited by H. L. SIDNEY LEAR. *New and Uniform Editions. Nine Vols.* 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d. each.*

FÉNELON'S SPIRITUAL LETTERS TO MEN.

FÉNELON'S SPIRITUAL LETTERS TO WOMEN.

A SELECTION FROM THE SPIRITUAL LETTERS OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES. Also *Cheap Edition*, 32*mo*, 6*d. cloth limp*; 1*s. cloth boards.*

THE SPIRIT OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE HIDDEN LIFE OF THE SOUL.

THE LIGHT OF THE CONSCIENCE. Also *Cheap Edition*, 32*mo*, 6*d. cloth limp*; and 1*s. cloth boards.*

SELF-RENUNCIATION. From the French.

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES' OF THE LOVE OF GOD.

SELECTIONS FROM PASCAL'S 'THOUGHTS.'

Lepine.—THE MINISTERS OF JESUS CHRIST: a Biblical Study. By J. FOSTER LEPINE, Curate of St. Paul's, Maidstone. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

Liddon.—Works by HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.

SERMONS ON SOME WORDS OF ST. PAUL. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

SERMONS PREACHED ON SPECIAL OCCASIONS, 1860-1889. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

EXPLANATORY ANALYSIS OF ST. PAUL'S FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY. 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

CLERICAL LIFE AND WORK: Sermons. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES: Lectures on Buddhism—Lectures on the Life of St. Paul—Papers on Dante. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

EXPLANATORY ANALYSIS OF ST. PAUL'S FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY. 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

EXPLANATORY ANALYSIS OF PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. 8*vo.* 14*s.*

SERMONS ON OLD TESTAMENT SUBJECTS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

SERMONS ON SOME WORDS OF CHRIST. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

THE DIVINITY OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1866. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

ADVENT IN ST. PAUL'S. *Two Vols. Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each. Cheap Edition in one Volume. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

CHRISTMASTIDE IN ST. PAUL'S. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

PASSIONTIDE SERMONS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

EASTER IN ST. PAUL'S. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Resurrection of our Lord. *Two Vols. Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each. Cheap Edition in one Volume. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. *Two Vols. Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each. Cheap Edition in one Volume. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

[*continued.*

Liddon.—Works by HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.—*continued.*

THE MAGNIFICAT. Sermons in St. Paul's. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

SOME ELEMENTS OF RELIGION. Lent Lectures. *Small* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.* [*The Crown* 8*vo. Edition* (5*s.*) *may still be had.*]

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

MAXIMS AND GLEANINGS. *Crown* 16*mo.* 1*s.*

Linklater.—TRUE LIMITS OF RITUAL IN THE CHURCH. Edited by Rev. ROBERT LINKLATER, D.D., Vicar of Stroud Green. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

CONTENTS.—Preface—Introductory Essay, by the Rev. ROBERT LINKLATER, D.D.—The Ornaments Rubric, by J. T. MICKLETHWAITE, V.P.S.A.—The Catholic Principle of Conformity in Divine Worship, by the Rev. C. F. G. TURNER—A Plea for Reasonableness, by the Rev. JOHN WYLDE—Intelligible Ritual, by the Rev. HENRY ARNOTT—The English Liturgy, by the Rev. T. A. LACEY—Eucharistic Ritual, by the Rev. W. F. COBB, D.D.—Suggestions for a Basis of Agreement in Matters Liturgical and Ceremonial, by the Rev. H. E. HALL.

Luckock.—Works by HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D., Dean of Lichfield.

THE HISTORY OF MARRIAGE, JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN, IN RELATION TO DIVORCE AND CERTAIN FORBIDDEN DEGREES. *Second Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

AFTER DEATH. An Examination of the Testimony of Primitive Times respecting the State of the Faithful Dead, and their Relationship to the Living. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE BETWEEN DEATH AND JUDGMENT. Being a Sequel to *After Death. Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

FOOTPRINTS OF THE SON OF MAN, as traced by St. Mark. Being Eighty Portions for Private Study, Family Reading, and Instruction in Church. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

FOOTPRINTS OF THE APOSTLES, as traced by St. Luke in the Acts. Being Sixty Portions for Private Study, and Instruction in Church. A Sequel to 'Footprints of the Son of Man, as traced by St. Mark.' *Two Vols. Crown* 8*vo.* 12*s.*

THE DIVINE LITURGY. Being the Order for Holy Communion, Historically, Doctrinally, and Devotionally set forth, in Fifty Portions. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. The Anglican Reform—The Puritan Innovations—The Elizabethan Reaction—The Caroline Settlement. With Appendices. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE BISHOPS IN THE TOWER. A Record of Stirring Events affecting the Church and Nonconformists from the Restoration to the Revolution. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

MacColl.—Works by the Rev. MALCOLM MACCOLL, D.D., Canon Residentiary of Ripon.

THE REFORMATION SETTLEMENT: Examined in the Light of History and Law. With an Introductory Letter to the Right Hon. W. V. Harcourt, M.P. *Crown* 8*vo*. 7*s*. 6*d*. *net*.

CHRISTIANITY IN RELATION TO SCIENCE AND MORALS. *Crown* 8*vo*. 6*s*.

LIFE HERE AND HEREAFTER: Sermons. *Crown* 8*vo*. 7*s*. 6*d*.

Mason.—Works by A. J. MASON, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge and Canon of Canterbury.

THE CONDITIONS OF OUR LORD'S LIFE UPON EARTH. Being the Bishop Paddock Lectures, 1896. To which is prefixed part of a First Professorial Lecture at Cambridge. *Crown* 8*vo*. 5*s*.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ECCLESIASTICAL UNITY. Four Lectures delivered in St. Asaph Cathedral. *Crown* 8*vo*. 3*s*. 6*d*.

THE FAITH OF THE GOSPEL. A Manual of Christian Doctrine. *Crown* 8*vo*. 7*s*. 6*d*. *Cheap Edition*. *Crown* 8*vo*. 3*s*. 6*d*.

THE RELATION OF CONFIRMATION TO BAPTISM. As taught in Holy Scripture and the Fathers. *Crown* 8*vo*. 7*s*. 6*d*.

Maturin.—Works by the Rev. B. W. MATURIN.

SOME PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. *Crown* 8*vo*. 4*s*. 6*d*.

PRACTICAL STUDIES ON THE PARABLES OF OUR LORD. *Crown* 8*vo*. 5*s*.

Medd.—THE PRIEST TO THE ALTAR; or, Aids to the Devout Celebration of Holy Communion, chiefly after the Ancient English Use of Sarum. By PETER GOLDSMITH MEDD, M.A., Canon of St. Alban's. Fourth Edition, revised and enlarged. *Royal* 8*vo*. 15*s*.

Meyrick.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON THE HOLY COMMUNION RESTATED AS A GUIDE AT THE PRESENT TIME. By the Rev. F. MEYRICK, M.A. *Crown* 8*vo*. 4*s*. 6*d*.

Mortimer.—Works by the Rev. A. G. MORTIMER, D.D., Rector of St. Mark's, Philadelphia.

JESUS AND THE RESURRECTION: Thirty Addresses for Good Friday and Easter. *Crown* 8*vo*. 5*s*.

CATHOLIC FAITH AND PRACTICE: A Manual of Theology. Two Parts. *Crown* 8*vo*. Sold separately. Part I. 7*s*. 6*d*. Part II. 9*s*.

HELPS TO MEDITATION: Sketches for Every Day in the Year.

Vol. I. ADVENT to TRINITY. 8*vo*. 7*s*. 6*d*.
Vol. II. TRINITY to ADVENT. 8*vo*. 7*s*. 6*d*.

STORIES FROM GENESIS: Sermons for Children. *Crown* 8*vo*. 4*s*.

THE LAWS OF HAPPINESS; or, The Beatitudes as teaching our Duty to God, Self, and our Neighbour. 18*mo*. 2*s*.

THE LAWS OF PENITENCE: Addresses on the Words of our Lord from the Cross. 16*mo*. 1*s*. 6*d*.

SERMONS IN MINIATURE FOR EXTEMPORE PREACHERS: Sketches for Every Sunday and Holy Day of the Christian Year. *Cr*. 8*vo*. 6*s*.

NOTES ON THE SEVEN PENITENTIAL PSALMS, chiefly from Patristic Sources. *Fcp*. 8*vo*. 3*s*. 6*d*.

THE SEVEN LAST WORDS OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER: with Meditations on some Scenes in His Passion. *Crown* 8*vo*. 5*s*.

LEARN OF JESUS CHRIST TO DIE: Addresses on the Words of our Lord from the Cross, taken as Teaching the way of Preparation for Death. 16*mo*. 2*s*.

Mozley.—Works by J. B. MOZLEY, D.D., late Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

ESSAYS, HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL. *Two Vols. 8vo. 24s.*

EIGHT LECTURES ON MIRACLES. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1865. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

RULING IDEAS IN EARLY AGES AND THEIR RELATION TO OLD TESTAMENT FAITH. *8vo. 6s.*

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, and on Various Occasions. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

SERMONS, PAROCHIAL AND OCCASIONAL. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

A REVIEW OF THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Newbolt.—Works by the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral.

RELIGION. *Crown 8vo. 5s.* (*The Oxford Library of Practical Theology.*)

PRIESTLY IDEALS; being a Course of Practical Lectures delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral to 'Our Society' and other Clergy, in Lent, 1898. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE GOSPEL OF EXPERIENCE; or, the Witness of Human Life to the truth of Revelation. Being the Boyle Lectures for 1895. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

COUNSELS OF FAITH AND PRACTICE: being Sermons preached on various occasions. *New and Enlarged Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.*

SPECULUM SACERDOTUM; or, the Divine Model of the Priestly Life. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

THE FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT. Being Ten Addresses bearing on the Spiritual Life. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

THE MAN OF GOD. *Small 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

THE PRAYER BOOK: Its Voice and Teaching. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Newman.—Works by JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, B.D., sometime Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford.

LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN DURING HIS LIFE IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH. With a brief Autobiography. Edited, at Cardinal Newman's request, by ANNE MOZLEY. *2 vols. Crown 8vo. 7s.*

PAROCHIAL AND PLAIN SERMONS. *Eight Vols. Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. each. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d. each.*

SELECTION, ADAPTED TO THE SEASONS OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR, from the 'Parochial and Plain Sermons,' *Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.*

FIFTEEN SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD *Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.*

SERMONS BEARING UPON SUBJECTS OF THE DAY. *Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

LECTURES ON THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION. *Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.*

*** *A Complete List of Cardinal Newman's Works can be had on Application.*

Osborne.—Works by EDWARD OSBORNE, Mission Priest of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley, Oxford.

THE CHILDREN'S SAVIOUR. Instructions to Children on the Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. *Illustrated.* 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE SAVIOUR KING. Instructions to Children on Old Testament Types and Illustrations of the Life of Christ. *Illustrated.* 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE CHILDREN'S FAITH. Instructions to Children on the Apostles' Creed. *Illustrated.* 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Ottley.—ASPECTS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: being the Bampton Lectures for 1897. By ROBERT LAWRENCE OTTLEY, M.A., Vicar of Winterbourne Bassett, Wilts; sometime Principal of the Pusey House. 8*vo.* *New and Cheaper Edition.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Oxford Library of Practical Theology.

PRODUCED UNDER THE EDITORSHIP OF

The Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's, and the Rev. F. E. BRIGHTMAN, M.A., Librarian of the Pusey House, Oxford.

The Price of each Volume will be Five Shillings.

The following is a list of Volumes as at present arranged :—

1. RELIGION. By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.* [*Ready.*
2. HOLY BAPTISM. By the Rev. DARWELL STONE, M.A., Principal of the Missionary College, Dorchester. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.* [*Ready.*
3. CONFIRMATION. By the Right Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., Bishop of Vermont.
4. HOLY MATRIMONY. By the Rev. W. J. KNOX LITTLE, M.A., Canon of Worcester.
5. THE HOLY COMMUNION. By the Rev. F. W. PULLER, M.A., Mission Priest of St. John Evangelist, Cowley.
6. THE PRAYER BOOK. By the Rev. LEIGHTON PULLAN, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford.
7. RELIGIOUS CEREMONIAL. By the Rev. F. E. BRIGHTMAN, M.A., Librarian of the Pusey House, Oxford.
8. PRAYER. By the Rev. A. J. WORLLEDGE, M.A., Canon of Truro.
9. VISITATION OF THE SICK. By the Rev. E. F. RUSSELL, M.A., St. Alban's, Holborn.

CONFESSION and ABSOLUTION.
FASTING and ALMSGIVING.
RETREATS, MISSIONS, ETC.
CHURCH WORK.
DEVOTIONAL BOOKS and READING.
ORDINATION.
FOREIGN MISSIONS.
THE BIBLE.

OUTLINES OF CHURCH TEACHING: a Series of Instructions for the Sundays and chief Holy Days of the Christian Year. For the Use of Teachers. By C. C. G. With Preface by the Very Rev. FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Oxenham.—THE VALIDITY OF PAPAL CLAIMS: Lectures delivered in Rome. By F. NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, D.D., English Chaplain at Rome. With a Letter by His Grace the ARCHBISHOP OF YORK. *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Paget.—Works by FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Dean of Christ Church.

STUDIES IN THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER: Sermons. With an Introductory Essay. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.* 6*d.*

THE SPIRIT OF DISCIPLINE: Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.* 6*d.*

FACULTIES AND DIFFICULTIES FOR BELIEF AND DISBELIEF. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.* 6*d.*

THE HALLOWING OF WORK. Addresses given at Eton, January 16-18, 1888. *Small 8vo.* 2*s.*

Percival.—SOME HELPS FOR SCHOOL LIFE. Sermons preached at Clifton College, 1862-1879. By J. PERCIVAL, D.D., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Hereford. New Edition, with New Preface. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Percival.—THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS. Treated Theologically and Historically. By HENRY R. PERCIVAL, M.A., D.D., Author of 'A Digest of Theology,' 'The Doctrine of the Episcopal Church,' etc. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

POCKET MANUAL OF PRAYERS FOR THE HOURS, ETC. With the Collects from the Prayer Book. *Royal 32mo.* 1*s.*

Powell.—THE PRINCIPLE OF THE INCARNATION. With especial Reference to the Relation between our Lord's Divine Omniscience and His Human Consciousness. By the Rev. H. C. POWELL, M.A. of Oriel College, Oxford; Rector of Wylye and Prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral. *8vo.* 16*s.*

PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS. By a CLERGYMAN. With Prefaces by H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., and the LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN. *Crown 8vo.*

THE BOOK OF GENESIS. 4*s.* 6*d.*
THE PSALMS. 5*s.*
ISAIAH. 4*s.* 6*d.*
THE MINOR PROPHETS. 4*s.* 6*d.*
THE HOLY GOSPELS. 4*s.* 6*d.*
ACTS TO REVELATION. 6*s.*

PRIEST'S PRAYER BOOK (THE). Containing Private Prayers and Intercessions; Occasional, School, and Parochial Offices; Offices for the Visitation of the Sick, with Notes, Readings, Collects, Hymns, Litanies, etc. With a brief Pontifical. By the late Rev. R. F. LITTLEDALE, LL.D., D.C.L., and Rev. J. EDWARD VAUX, M.A., F.S.A. *New Edition, Revised.* 20*th Thousand.* *Post 8vo.* 6*s.* 6*d.*

Pullan.—LECTURES ON RELIGION. By the Rev. LEIGHTON PULLAN, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Lecturer in Theology at Oriel and Queen's Colleges, Oxford. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

Pusey.—SPIRITUAL LETTERS OF EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D. Edited and prepared for publication by the Rev. J. O. JOHNSTON, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, Cuddesdon; and the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. *8vo.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

Randolph.—Works by B. W. RANDOLPH, M.A., Principal of the Theological College and Hon. Canon of Ely.

MEDITATIONS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT for Every Day in the Year. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

THE THRESHOLD OF THE SANCTUARY: being Short Chapters on the Inner Preparation for the Priesthood. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE LAW OF SINAI: being Devotional Addresses on the Ten Commandments delivered to Ordinands. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Rede.—Works by WYLLYS REDE, D.D., Rector of the Church of the Incarnation, and Canon of the Cathedral, Atalanta, Georgia.

STRIVING FOR THE MASTERY: Daily Lessons for Lent. *Cr. 8vo.* 5*s.*

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS: a Lost Link in the Chain of the Church's Creed. With a Preface by LORD HALIFAX. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Romanes.—THOUGHTS ON THE COLLECTS FOR THE TRINITY SEASON. By ETHEL ROMANES, Author of 'The Life and Letters of George John Romanes,' 'The Hallowing of Sorrow.' With a Preface by the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF STEPNEY. *18mo, gilt edges.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Sanday.—Works by W. SANDAY, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

THE CONCEPTION OF PRIESTHOOD IN THE EARLY CHURCH AND IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND: Four Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

INSPIRATION: Eight Lectures on the Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1893. *New and Cheaper Edition, with New Preface. 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Scudamore.—STEPS TO THE ALTAR: a Manual of Devotion for the Blessed Eucharist. By the Rev. W. E. SCUDAMORE, M.A. *Royal 32mo.* 1*s.*

On toned paper, with red rubrics, 2s: The same, with Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, 2s. 6d; Demy 18mo. cloth, 1s; Demy 18mo. cloth, large type, 1s. 3d; Imperial 32mo. limp cloth, 6d.

Simpson.—THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE. By the Rev. W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Regent's Park. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

MEMOIR OF THE REV. W. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D., Sub-Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral. Compiled and Edited by W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON. With Portrait and other Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

Strange.—INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN THE DIVINE: Being an attempt to make this book more intelligible to the ordinary reader and so to encourage the study of it. By Rev. CRESSWELL STRANGE, M.A., Vicar of Edgbaston, and Honorary Canon of Worcester. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Strong.—CHRISTIAN ETHICS: being the Bampton Lectures for 1895. By THOMAS B. STRONG, B.D., Student of Christ Church, Oxford, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Durham. *New and Cheaper Edition. 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Tee.—THE SANCTUARY OF SUFFERING. By ELEANOR TEE, Author of 'This Everyday Life,' etc. With a Preface by the Rev. J. P. F. DAVIDSON, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthias', Earl's Court; President of the 'Guild of All Souls.' *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Whishaw.—THE CHILDREN'S YEAR-BOOK OF PRAYER AND PRAISE. By C. M. WHISHAW, Compiler of 'Being and Doing.' *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Williams.—Works by the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D.

A DEVOTIONAL COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL NARRATIVE. *Eight Vols. Crown 8vo. 5s. each.*

THOUGHTS ON THE STUDY OF THE HOLY GOSPELS.
A HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.
OUR LORD'S NATIVITY.
OUR LORD'S MINISTRY (Second Year).
OUR LORD'S MINISTRY (Third Year).
THE HOLY WEEK.
OUR LORD'S PASSION.
OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION.

FEMALE CHARACTERS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. A Series of Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

THE CHARACTERS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

THE APOCALYPSE. With Notes and Reflections. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

SERMONS ON THE EPISTLES AND GOSPELS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo. 5s. each.*

PLAIN SERMONS ON CATECHISM. *Two Vols. Cr. 8vo. 5s. each.*

Wilson.—THOUGHTS ON CONFIRMATION. By Rev. R. J. WILSON, D.D., late Warden of Keble College. *16mo. 1s. 6d.*

Wirgman.—Works by A. THEODORE WIRGMAN, B.D., D.C.L., Vice-Provost of St. Mary's Collegiate Church, Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

THE DOCTRINE OF CONFIRMATION. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

THE CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY OF BISHOPS IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. Illustrated by the History and Canon Law of the Undivided Church from the Apostolic Age to the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Wood.—THE STORY OF A SAINTLY BISHOP'S LIFE—LANCELOT ANDREWES, Bishop of Winchester, 1555-1626. By Lady Mary Wood. *Crown* 8*vo*. 1*s*. 6*d*.

Wordsworth.—Works by CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., sometime Bishop of Lincoln.

THE HOLY BIBLE (the Old Testament). With Notes, Introductions, and Index. *Imperial* 8*vo*.

Vol. I. THE PENTATEUCH. 25*s*. Vol. II. JOSHUA TO SAMUEL. 15*s*. Vol. III. KINGS to ESTHER. 15*s*. Vol. IV. JOB TO SONG OF SOLOMON. 25*s*. Vol. V. ISAIAH TO EZEKIEL. 25*s*. Vol. VI. DANIEL, MINOR PROPHETS, and Index. 15*s*.

Also supplied in 12 *Parts. Sold separately.*

THE NEW TESTAMENT, in the Original Greek. With Notes, Introductions, and Indices. *Imperial* 8*vo*.

Vol. I. GOSPELS AND ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. 23*s*. Vol. II. EPISTLES, APOCALYPSE, and Indices. 37*s*.

Also supplied in 4 *Parts. Sold separately.*

A CHURCH HISTORY TO A.D. 451. *Four Vols. Crown* 8*vo*.

Vol. I. TO THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA, A.D. 325. 8*s*. 6*d*. Vol. II. FROM THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA TO THAT OF CONSTANTINOPLE 6*s*. Vol. III. CONTINUATION. 6*s*. Vol. IV. CONCLUSION, TO THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON, A.D. 451. 6*s*.

THEOPHILUS ANGLICANUS: a Manual of Instruction on the Church and the Anglican Branch of it. 12*mo*. 2*s*. 6*d*.

ELEMENTS OF INSTRUCTION ON THE CHURCH. 16*mo*. 1*s*. *cloth*. 6*d*. *sewed*.

THE HOLY YEAR: Original Hymns. 16*mo*. 2*s*. 6*d*. *and* 1*s*. *Limp*, 6*d*.

,, ,, With Music. Edited by W. H. MONK. *Square* 8*vo*. 4*s*. 6*d*.

ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE OF THE SOUL AFTER DEATH. 32*mo*. 1*s*.

Wordsworth.—Works by JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D., Lord Bishop of Salisbury.

THE EPISCOPATE OF CHARLES WORDSWORTH, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of St. Andrews. With Two Portraits. 8*vo*. 15*s*.

THE HOLY COMMUNION: Four Visitation Addresses. 1891. *Crown* 8*vo*. 3*s*. 6*d*.

THE ONE RELIGION: Truth, Holiness, and Peace desired by the Nations, and revealed by Jesus Christ. Eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford in 1881. *Second Edition. Crown* 8*vo*. 7*s*. 6*d*.

UNIVERSITY SERMONS ON GOSPEL SUBJECTS. *Sm*. 8*vo*. 2*s*. 6*d*.

PRAYERS FOR USE IN COLLEGE. 16*mo*. 1*s*.

10,000/6/99.

Printed by T. and A. CONSTABLE, Printers to Her Majesty at the Edinburgh University Press.

29598 252P M133

MacColl, M.

Life here and hereafter.

252P M133 29598